DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 643 TM 005 137

AUTHOR	Dysinger, Dale W.
TITLE	Title VIII Student Support Program: Minneapolis Public Schools. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	C-74-7
PUB DATE	Jul 75
NOTE	117p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Gains; American Indians; Attendance; *Dropout Prevention; Educational Objectives; *Junior High Schools; Low Achievers; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Senior High Schools; Special Programs; Student Evaluation; Student Improvement; Urban Schools; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VIII; ESEA Title VIII; Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The Title VIII Student Support Program (SSP) of the Minneapolis Public Schools was initiated in the 1971-72 school year. This report describes activities of the project for the final (fourth) year and includes descriptions and some comparisons with the previous years. The purpose of the program is to design and implement various ways of reducing the student dropout rate for grades 7-12 at two junior high schools and two senior high schools in inner city Minneapolis. During the course of the four year operation the program has been organized within three components: the Education Component, the Student and Family Support Component and the Work Experience Component. Since the dropout rate for American Indian students in Minneapolis schools is especially high, many of the students selected for the program are American Indians. Although improvements are evident in the three program components, the program has not shown a significant effect on the dropout pattern. Lack of attendance and tardiness still seemed to be a large factor with most students in the program regarding work programs and school attendance.
(Author/DEP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118643

Title VIII Student Support Program

Minneapolis Public Schools

Final Evaluation Report

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by:

Dale W. Dysinger

July, 1975

TM005 137

C-74-7
July 1975

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services

BOARD OF EDUCATION

W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Richard F. Allen | Marilyn A. Borea | Carol R. Lind
John M. Mason | Philip A. Olson | Jane A. Starr

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

John B. Davis, Jr.

Special School District No. 1
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writers wish to thank the principals of the schools that had units of the Student Support Program in their schools--South High, Mr. Ken Northwick; Franklin Junior High, Mr. Dean Berntsen; Phillips Junior High, Mr. Harold Younghans and Mr. Robert Lynch; and North High, Mr. David W. Roffers and Dr. Richard Green. These men provided liaison personnel from their staff to work with SSP and the evaluator. Clerical staffs were also helpful in assisting the evaluation effort by granting access and assisting in the interpretation of school records. The willing assistance of personnel in the Districts' Information Services Center, particularly that of the Coordinator of Research, Mr. F. T. Randall, is acknowledged. The evaluator also wishes to express his gratitude for the cooperativeness of the entire Student Support staff during the years of the evaluation efforts--Leanne Phinney, Linda Teigen, Carolyn Brave Heart, Christina Flicken and Kathleen Weinbeck. The project manager, Mr. Donald Gurnoe, has provided support and counsel throughout the years of the program. He has provided useful ideas and support for the evaluation effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 4

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SETTING 5

The City. 5
The Schools 6
Special Factors Related to Some Student Dropouts. 9

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT SUPPORT PROGRAM . . . 12

Program Structure 12
Facilities and Equipment. 14
Project Supervision 14
Project Students. 15
Additional Comments 18
End of School Review. 20
Budget. 24

INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES . . 25

OVERALL OBJECTIVES 26

Process Objective Number 1. 27
Process Objective Number 2. 30
Process Objective Number 3. 32
Process Objective Number 4. 34
Process Objective Number 5. 38
Product Objective Number 1. 40
Product Objective Number 2. 44
Product Objective Number 3. 46

EDUCATION COMPONENT OBJECTIVES 48

Process Objective Number 1. 49
Process Objective Number 2. 52
Process Objective Number 3. 54
Product Objective Number 1. 62

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT OBJECTIVES. 64

Process Objective Number 1. 65
Process Objective Number 2. 66
Process Objective Number 3. 70
Process Objective Number 4. 72
Product Objective Number 1. 74
Product Objective Number 2. 76

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES 78

Process Objective Number 1. 79
Process Objective Number 2. 81
Process Objective Number 3. 85
Product Objective Number 1. 86

APPENDIX 88

Problems of Urban Indian Students in the Schools 89
Orientation Sessions at Phillips Junior High School 95
Educational Attainments and Current Employment of Title VIII Staff Members. 103
Memorandum: Special Project Hiring Policies. . . .108

SUMMARY

The Title VIII Student Support Program (SSP) of the Minneapolis Public Schools was initiated in the 1971-72 school year. This report describes activities of the project for the final (fourth) year and includes descriptions and some comparisons with the previous years.

The purpose of the program is to design and implement various wasy of reducing the student dropout rate for grades 7-12 at two junior high schools and two senior high schools in inner city Minneapolis. During the course of the four year operation the program has been organized within three components: the Education Component, the Student and Family Support Component and the Work Experience Component. Since the dropout rate for American Indian students in Minneapolis schools is especially high, many of the students selected for the program are American Indians.

During this final year efforts were made by SSP staff and school administrators to phase out those aspects of the program which cannot be realistically continued without the aid of the increased number of personnel provided by the program and to merge other aspects into the regular school structure. The Education Component has been gradually reduced over the last three years. Students have been assisted toward making the transition from the small personalized SSP classes to next year's larger, more traditional classroom atmosphere. The Social Component activities were somewhat increased in the final year by the assignment of a social worker at each school. The Work Experience Component has been increased so that some work was provided during the summer of 1974.

This evaluation has shown some changes in program operation and effectiveness during this year. Considerable progress was made at the beginning of the year in terms of better initial plans for students. Updating of student files

and documenting activities of the program became more of a problem at the end of the year. It was more difficult to handle file documentation with the recent court decisions related to personal privacy. There has been marked improvement in the number of course credits received by South High SSP students in the last two years. The improvement can be attributed to the change from modular scheduling and the granting of credits to students in small individualized SSP classes. At the present time student attendance is better in most classes, providing students with more exposure to the subject matter. Class attendance is highly related to the number of credits attained. SSP experience shows that the kinds of students in this program can handle the academic requirements of their classes if their attendance is relatively consistent.

The Family and Student Support Component of the program provides interactions of social worker aides with students and parents. These activities are diverse, including work with students during school and after school in non-classroom situations, talking with parents about home problems, and working with other social action agencies in the area to assist students in their lives. This portion of SSP has assisted a few students in dealing with the court, the parole officer, drug rehabilitation agencies, etc.

The Work Experience Component provided part-time jobs for SSP students. Supervisors reported that the students were generally good workers; the major areas of complaint were poor attendance, tardiness and the failure of absentees to call the employer to inform him of their absence.

Overall, the program has not been able to demonstrate a marked shift in the dropout pattern. Students in SSP seem to be maintained longer in school; however, the effect on other students in the school seems to have been minimal. Without appropriate control groups, however, it is difficult to assess this assertion.

For most SSP students their graduation from high school seems to be dependent upon maintenance of reasonable school attendance and, therefore, maintenance of normal progress in the earning of credits toward graduation. The social and general family problems that are a part of the issues facing most of these students make supportive assistance by individuals within the school a key element in successful maintenance of these students within the school structure. It seems that the part-time work provided through the school is a useful point of reference for many of these students.

INTRODUCTION

This final evaluation report describes activities of the Title VIII Student Support Program (SSP) in the Minneapolis Public Schools. It provides the basic information for the final year of the program, 1974-75, and summarizes activities over the four year span of the project.

As with previous reports the basic data are presented to indicate progress toward objectives of the program. The objectives listed in this report represent a modification of the objectives that were used for previous years' reports. The following two sections of the report contain general descriptive information about the Minneapolis schools and the Student Support Program within this setting.

A major change in school scheduling has significantly affected the data gathering process. During the 1972-73 school year all schools were on the semester system. South High changed to the trimester system for the 1973-74 school year. This year North High School, Franklin Junior High and South High are on the trimester system, leaving only Phillips Junior High on the semester system.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SETTING

The City

This Title VIII project is located in Minneapolis, a city of 424,000 people located on the Mississippi River in the southeastern part of Minnesota. With its somewhat smaller twin city, Saint Paul, it is the center of a seven county metropolitan area of over two million, the largest population center between Chicago and the Pacific coast. As such it serves as an economic hub for the entire upper midwest region of the country.

While the Title VIII project serves four schools in what could be classified as the "ghetto" area, the ghetto in Minneapolis bears small resemblance to the ghettos of most cities. The streets are relatively clean and well kept, the houses often old, but large and sturdy. Most homes throughout the city are single family dwellings and owner-occupied. The overall tenor of the city is one of stability. Most Minneapolitans are native-born Americans, but about 35,000 (8 percent) are foreign born, consisting primarily of Swedes, Norwegians, Germans and Canadians.

Relatively few non-white citizens live in Minneapolis, although their numbers are increasing. In 1960 only 3 percent of the population was non-white, but the 1970 census revealed that this figure had doubled. About 80 percent of the non-whites are Black Americans, with most of the remaining non-white population being American Indian, mostly Chippewa and Dakota (Sioux). In 1970 non-white residents made up 6.5 percent of the city's population but accounted for 15 percent of the children in the city's elementary schools. In 1974-75 the minority enrollment in the public elementary schools is estimated as 21.8 percent; in the entire student body the minority proportion is about 19.1 percent.

One's first impression is that Minneapolis doesn't really have serious problems of blight or decay. A comparative look at large cities across the nation would rank Minneapolis' inner city area as merely a lower middle class area. Minority members who occupy the area, however, see their living conditions, social, economic and educational, as seriously deficient. While the Minneapolis Public Schools are making strong efforts to open communications between community and school, from the viewpoint of most minority members in the area at least, the lag between need and action justifies frustration and anger.

There has been a steady migration to the city by Indian Americans from the reservations and by poor whites from the small towns and rural areas of Minnesota. They come to Minneapolis looking for a better way of life; some find it, many do not. For an Indian family, this initial migration may be only one of many moves either between city residences or back and forth between city and reservation.

In 1957 the city supported one out of ten of the state's Indian Americans who were on relief; in 1969 the city supported three out of ten. Estimates of the Indian unemployment rate vary but range as high as 60 percent.

The Schools

As of October of 1974 about 66,650 children were enrolled in various schools in Minneapolis. Most of them, about 56,160, attend one of the city's public schools. There has been a general increase in the number of minority students in the public schools during the last five years. The number has increased from 8,170 (12%) in 1969 to 10,720 (19.1%) in 1974. At the same time the total enrollment in the Minneapolis Public Schools has decreased. This is a familiar pattern in recent years in urban school systems. The sight counts* show

*Estimates of the ehtnic composition of the student body are made annually by a Sight Count of Pupils. Basically, these estimates are judgments by homeroom teachers of the ethnic identification of all their pupils on the roll on a specific date. Although there is some error involved in these judgments, these figures are the best data available.

these increases in minority enrollment and additionally show that the proportion of Native Americans (American Indians) is increasing within the minority groups. These data also show that Indian representation in the elementary schools (5.88%) is over twice that in the high schools (2.61%).

Based on sight counts, the proportion of Black American pupils in all schools for 1974-75 was 12.5 percent. Nine years ago the proportion was 5.4 percent. Indian American children currently comprise 4.8 percent of the school population, over twice the proportion of six years ago.

The proportion of minority children in the various elementary schools generally reflects the prevailing housing pattern found in each school area. The Indian American population in the city is concentrated in the same general areas as the Black Americans. Although some non-white pupils are enrolled in every elementary school, non-white pupils are concentrated in two relatively small areas of the city. These same areas of the city have the lowest median incomes in the city and the highest concentrations of dilapidated housing, juvenile delinquency and welfare cases. In addition, the proportion of school age children in AFDC homes has increased from approximately 12 percent in 1962 to 25 percent in 1974. While in 1969, in then elementary schools 30 percent or more of their pupils came from homes participating in AFDC programs, there were 27 such schools in 1974. Analyses reveal that dropout rates are highest in areas of the city where the highest concentrations of low income and minority people reside.

Information about students who leave the Minneapolis Public Schools is categorized according to codes established by the State of Minnesota. Codes are as follows:

(Non-dropout codes)

W3	Transferred to a nonpublic school
W4	Moved out of district or state
W7	Graduated
W8	Died
W11D	Drafted

(Dropout codes)

W5	Quit school after passing compulsary age because of: a) school problems b) economic problems
W6	Issued work permit
W9	Excused because of mental or physical reasons
W10	Committed to correctional institution
W11E	Enlisted in armed service
W12	Left school because of marriage
W13	Left school because of: a) expulsion b) pregnancy c) other
W14	Left school for reasons unknown

An annual report which enumerates withdrawals by grade level for each of the above categories is prepared for the state by the Department of Information Services, Minneapolis Public Schools.

Responsibility for assigning codes to students who withdraw rests with different people in different schools. School social workers, attendance clerks and assistant principals may have sole or joint responsibility, depending on the schools. There is some inconsistency between schools in actually defining who has "left school." In some cases a child who attends school very intermittently may be carried on the school rolls; in another school such a child would be withdrawn. After a student has passed the compulsory age for school attendance of 16, his continued absence from school is more likely to be officially listed as withdrawn. A more detailed discussion of problems associated with dropout (withdrawal) information is included in the Appendix.

It may also be noted that not all students in these categories are dropouts in the sense that they leave school permanently. Many students who "drop out" for school or economic problems (W5a and 5b) or pregnancy and for "other" reasons (W13b, 13c) re-enroll again, either in the same or in subsequent school years (although they often drop out again).

Students who withdraw in the W9 category may have health problems that necessitate hospitalization; the child may continue some education while he is hospitalized. Conversely, some children who are not categorizes as dropouts (W3, for example) may transfer to one of the several of the city's storefront community schools; he/she may remain on the rolls of these schools but seldom attend.

The overall dropout rate in Minneapolis is very low compared with school systems across the nation. It is estimated that about 85 percent of all children entering ninth grade in Minneapolis will eventually graduate. In a majority of schools the school system seems to be meeting the educational needs of their children. In a few schools, however, more than one fourth of the students do not graduate. It is these schools which are of interest to this Title VIII project.

Of the eleven senior high schools in the district, South High School, one of the project schools, had the highest dropout rate for 1969-70--26 percent. For the junior high project schools, the 6 percent dropout rate at Phillips Junior High is the highest rate in the city, with Franklin Junior High ranking second to Phillips with a 4 percent dropout rate in the 1969-70 school year.

Official reasons for withdrawals from the three project schools fall predominantly in the categories listed as "school problems" (W5a) and "economic problems" (W5b). However, these "official" reasons for dropping out generally shed little light on the specific causative factors. Additional information is needed.

Special Factors Related to Some Student Dropouts

Initial planning for this proposal was conducted during the period February 1969 to November 1969. This planning focused exclusively on dropout problems among American Indians. Although it is not possible to compute dropout rate by race since the withdrawal data do not indicate the child's race,

observations and other data sources indicate that the dropout rates are particularly high among Indian students. For example, during project planning at Phillips Junior High School, Indians constituted 20 percent of the school population, but almost 50 percent of the dropouts were Indian.

Information supplied by the Indian community during the project planning period and a number of research studies describe some of the reasons for the high dropout rate among Indians. This information is categorized under two main headings: 1) socio-cultural reasons; and 2) economic reasons.

For most children school is considered a training ground for adulthood. It is viewed as an important step in obtaining a good initial job or in obtaining entry to an advanced training setting. When schools are not seen in this light, they have less relevance or motivating power for students. For most Indian students school is not seen in this light. The jobs held by adults that they know have little relationship to the educational level achieved by these adults.

Confusion about his identity and often the tendency to reject his Indian culture is seen as another factor leading to school dropout. Indian youth who attempt to compete with white classmates are at a disadvantage because the competition takes place in the white man's arena--the school. Books, curriculum, physical setting, regulations and most importantly teachers reflect a culture which is frequently foreign and sometimes hostile to Indian culture. Many Indian students do not attempt to compete, since individual competition in this kind of setting is alien to their culture. Many bide their time and officially leave school when they turn sixteen. A few remain to graduate, but the diploma does not necessarily open doors for employment, nor is it necessarily valued by their peers. This is a culture conflict not only in the sense that one culture sets the dominant values but also in the sense that the individual is in conflict over competing aspects of two cultures. Should I live on the reservation or in the city? Should I go to

school or "go to work"? Should I be an Indian or a white man? These disturbing questions and the derogatory view of the Indian expressed by some portions of the white society frequently result in a poor self-concept among Indian youth. It has been observed that urban Indian parents generally do not interact with public school administrators and teachers concerning their children's school training. School officials often interpret this lack of interaction as lack of interest in their children's formal education. Many Indian parents have had unpleasant experiences with the educational system. It is not surprising that their reaction to administrators' requests for parental involvement is met with distrust and suspicion or passivity.

Even if many of these cultural problems were resolved, some Indian youth would drop out of school due to economic necessity. Poverty has a direct influence on the Indian child's attendance. Children of the Indian community are very often removed from school to babysit or perform household tasks to free an older brother, sister or parent to take part-time work. This practice extends to family members, aunts, uncles, cousins and grandparents, for the strength of the extended family is an important part of the Indian culture.

The annual rice harvest also affects urban Indian children. An employment survey of Indians living in Minneapolis showed that about 50 percent of these city residents participated in the annual wild rice harvest. Ricing and the associated festival activities in September typically involve entire families, including the children. The urban school schedules do not allow for this important Indian family activity, and Indian children returning to school in the fall may be as much as a month late in entering the academic program.

The lack of perceived relationships between education and job satisfaction, the various aspects of the educational process which conflict with the Indian culture, and poverty, itself culture-connected, are seen as major causes of school dropouts for many of the children involved in this project.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT SUPPORT PROGRAM

Program Structure

There are three basic components of the Student Support Program (SSP): the Educational Component, the Student and Family Support Component and the Work Experience Component.

The Educational Component consists primarily of SSP teachers providing individual and small group work to improve skills in reading and mathematics. Some formal classes of SSP students were conducted by SSP teachers. It also includes tutoring on specific course work by both teachers and other SSP staff members.

The Work Experience Component places students in jobs and pays the students an hourly wage. It not only provides some economic assistance and basic occupational information for junior high and high school students through work experience, but also provides some career exploration and occupational training for a few students on the senior high school level for whom appropriate jobs can be obtained. The jobs that are available include the private as well as the public sector and include some training and skill developing opportunities not ordinarily available through public school channels.

The main objective of the Family and Student Support Component is to develop more positive parental attitudes toward schools and education so that these attitudes can be passed on to children and reinforced in the home as well as in the school setting. This is attempted through many program activities with both the student and the family. Interactions between students and SSP aides occur in the schools, special field trips and in the homes. The emphasis given to this component is relatively unique for Title VIII programs.

Home visits are made primarily by the School-Community Social Worker Aides. However, social workers and teachers

also make home visits. These consist of the Student Support Program representatives calling at the home and talking to the parent(s) about SSP, their child's progress, problems, etc. Typically these visits also provide the SSP representative with a perception of the home situation, the ways in which the parent/guardian interacts with the school, the sibling situation and the expectations of the home for the student. When alternative educational programs seem indicated, these are discussed with the parent. Although no format can be specified for the home visit, the interaction of school representatives and the home provides an avenue for sharing information that is often the only substantive exchange between the school and the home. Involvement of the parent with the school in planning for their children's training can assist both the family and the schools. The typical parents of SSP students have not, in previous years, had much interaction with school personnel except on a negative basis when serious problems have occurred. Home visits of SSP staff are planned as a part of the routine program, not only when there is some specific problem at the school.

Other parent interactions occur during SSP sponsored social events, at court hearings, evening courses, at chance meetings of SSP staff and parents in the community, and in telephone conversations. Home visits as originally planned by the program are often difficult to arrange and carry out, especially in families with working parents or in cases where family difficulties exist. Some families resist formal visits by school representatives. Factions within the community always change. Even though most of the school-community social worker aides come from the community in which they work, factionalization of families within the community often interferes with stable continued contact between aide and student. For these reasons, many contacts made by the aides are less formal then had originally been planned. Meetings, more often than not, are unplanned or take place informally. These con[illegible]s are

often the most positive because of their informality and the lack of pressure felt by the parent. In situations such as these, parents often initiate the discussion. The previous "home visit" listings in the evaluation reports have been broadened to include all parent contacts.

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities for the program have been provided in each school. These offices and classrooms serve as headquarters for the SSP staff and students for conferences, tutoring, etc. In some of the schools, notably North High School and Franklin Junior High School, the lack of space limits effective staff-individual student conferences.

Special equipment such as audio visual, TV tape facilities, reading training devices, etc. are available for each of the SSP units.

Project Supervision

An administrative staff coordinates the program in the schools. It is led by a Project Manager. The school SSP Coordinator position specifies a point of contact for SSP staff and the school administrators and provides a key link between project supervision, school administrators and the SSP staff.

In the first year of the project the Project Manager had formal administrative responsibility for all project components and for liaison with all of the schools. This proved to be a structure that could not react to all issues raised by the staff and the school administrators in a timely way. The current administrative structure evolved from experience over the years and now provides an individual at each school who can respond to immediate issues. Overall, there has been more effective coordination of SSP and the schools with the revised organizational structure.

Project Students

The students selected for the program are those thought to be in a "high dropout potential" category. Recommendations of individual students may come from school administrators, teachers, counselors or SSP staff members. A committee composed of an SSP staff member representing each program component reviews a student's record in terms of: absenteeism and truancy, classroom performance in relation to ability and achievement test data, and family economic and social situation. The committee then decides whether this student should be included in the program. (A decision may be made that a particular student should enter only one of the three components.) Acceptance of a student in the program requires agreement of the student, the parent(s), the school administration and the SSP staff.

The indivudals who are selected for the program tend to be students who have high rates of absenteeism and tardiness, who have not been as successful as most students academically, who may have had difficulties with authorities in the school and in the community, and who often come from homes that are less stable and responsive to the school program. Although this characterization does not apply to each of the SSP students, essentially all students have some of the problems listed above.

During the final year of the project fewer new students were selected for the program. The emphasis of the staff was on providing services to students who had been on the program and on integrating them into the regular school program.

Over the four years of the project changes in emphasis and/or points of attack toward the dropout problem have taken place. Originally, the Educational Component activities were a major portion of the program. (In the first two years there were four teachers assigned to each school unit.) As the project evolved the need for and the effectiveness of formal classroom activity within the program changed. The alternative educational facilities available in the Minneapolis

schools provide well-trained resource facilities. These facilities were utilized more extensively in the final two years of the project.

More emphasis was placed on the Job Component in the final years, since students and staff reported that many of the successes with individual students seemed to be related to the students' work activities. In addition, activities in dealing with social service agencies proved to be more necessary than originally envisioned. Court appearances, probation officer contacts, drug and alcohol treatment facilities, etc. were utilized rather extensively.

The involvement of individuals in the community changed over the four year period. Originally, a community board was formed to provide liaison and advice to SSP. Attendance at the board meetings was poor; seldom was a quorum present. However, parent aides were hired to work for the project in the schools. This hiring program was accelerated so that during the final years many of the paraprofessional staff were adults from the community.

In the discussions of attainment or non-attainment of the various objectives of the project additional comments are made concerning changes in SSP over the four year span of the project.

The proportion of American Indian students included in the program is much larger than the proportion in each student body. This seems to be appropriate and reflects the fact that the dropout rate of American Indians in the Minneapolis schools is much larger than the rate for any other ethnic group. The ethnic distribution of students for the 1974-75 school year is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

ETHNIC COMPOSITION

School	Native American (Indian)		Black American		Spanish Surname Americans		All Other Americans	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Franklin Jr. High								
SSP Students	6	21%	5	18%	---	---	17	61%
Entire School*	43	8%	115	21%	14	3%	383	69%
Phillips Jr. High								
SSP Students	42	93%	---	---	---	---	3	7%
Entire School	237	31%	42	6%	2	0%	467	61%
South High								
SSP Students	43	78%	1	2%	1	2%	10	18%
Entire School	170	13%	46	4%	25	2%	1036	80%
North High								
SSP Students	18	37%	18	37%	1	2%	12	24%
Entire School	111	6%	685	36%	32	2%	1073	56%

*School estimates are based on the 1974-75 Pupil-Personnel Sight Count published by the Minneapolis Public Schools.

Over the years the ethnic distributions of the schools and SSP participants has changed. The following table shows these changes for the three schools involved in all years of the project.

Ethnic Composition in Percent
for the Years 1971-72 through 1974-75

	Indian				Black				All Other			
	Years				Years				Years			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Franklin Jr. High												
SSP Students	39	34	27	21	14	24	38	18	48	42	35	61
Entire School	13	7	11	8	17	24	19	21	70	74	70	72
Phillips Jr. High												
SSP Students	50	60	80	93	3	3	2	0	47	37	18	7
Entire School	25	33	33	31	9	3	5	6	66	59	62	61
South High												
SSP Students	38	62	72	78	5	3	2	2	56	35	26	20
Entire School	9	9	11	13	5	3	4	4	87	86	85	82

This shows that SSP has substantially increased the proportion of Indian students on the program at both Phillips Junior High and South High Schools.

Additional Comments

Some of the general goals of the Student Support Program involve changing attitudes of the overall community toward the public schools so that a larger proportion of the high school students will continue to graduation. This overall goal is aimed primarily at the Indian community.

A dramatic change in the number of Indian students graduating from high school occurred during the 1973-74 school year. There were 61 Indian students who received high school diplomas in 1973-74, while in the previous year it has been reported that many fewer Indian students graduated. The ethnic identification of graduates is not generally known. Counts for previous years are not considered to be accurate. Three of last year's graduates were in SSP. The exact number of Indian graduates for the year 1974-75 is uncertain. A partial count lists 37 Indian student graduates. Nine of these were SSP students. The program staff would make no claim that SSP has changed attitudes of Indian students toward high school graduation. However, the Title VIII program has certainly played a large role in the dramatic increase of student and parental involvement in the schools during the last four years, if only by increasing the accessibility of the schools to the Indian community. The program has highlighted the dropout problem and, along with many other efforts within the community and the schools, has made its contributions toward this kind of attitude change.

The evaluator contends that one of the key factors and contributions of SSP has been the hiring of Native American adults to work in the program. Many of the staff members are Indian. This provides Indian students with examples of the kinds of job opportunities that are available for them if they continue in school. More importantly, however, these staff members are able to convey to the general Indian community information and attitudes toward formal education and the schools. Many of the staff members live in the community and have children and/or relatives in the student body. Although no formal objectives toward the hiring of Native American staff have been included in the evaluation plan, this generally agreed upon goal of the program has been accomplished. It would not be contended that all of these employees have the best available "formal qualifications" for their particular assignments; however, their understanding of the Indian student

and community is a demonstrable strength of the Student Support Program. Some of these Native American SSP staff members are also effective in relating to regular school staff and interpreting Indian culture and the reactions of many of the Indian students.

The Student Support Program has served as a major vehicle for bringing Indian people into the school system. The advantages are many; Indian people gain experience in working within the school system. The community sees Indian people participating in school system activity. Successful models are present for Indian students to emulate. Indian employees find encouragement to increase their education. Since its inception, the Student Support Program has employed 21 certified and 33 non-certified American Indians. Forty-eight of the total of 96 employees from all ethnic backgrounds are known to have enrolled in some college level (or graduate level) courses either during or subsequent to working for SSP.

A review of this subject was completed during October of 1974 and updated at the end of the program. The revised report of the study is included in the Appendix.

End of School Review

The evaluation staff asked the aides and/or social workers to review all of their students and fill out a questionnaire related to each student's experience in SSP. In addition, they were asked to contact the student by a home visit or a telephone call to obtain student and/or parent reactions. Completed forms were obtained for 130 of the 177 students who were on the end of the year roll. Sixty-five of these students were personally contacted either at their home or by telephone.

The end of school review form asked the aide/social worker to describe how they felt SSP had helped (or hurt) the student. The comments focused on the assistance provided by the work component and the daily contact of the "aide" with the student.

A few comments also recognized the assistance of SSP teachers. It was the judgment of the aide or social worker in a few isolated instances that SSP was not at all effective with a student and was even counter productive with a very few. These students either resented the constant "surveillance" or they found they could use the SSP office and/or staff as excuses for not doing their school work. The other questions and responses of the staff on the end of school questionnaire are listed below:

2. Do you think this student will graduate from high school?

	North N=37	South N=29	Franklin N=25	Phillips N=39
Definitely	5	9	1	7
Probably	8	11	8	20
Questionable	13	7	9	6
Unlikely	7	2	7	3
Never	4	0	0	0
No response	0	0	0	3

3. Has SSP helped this student in a court appearance this year?

Yes	9	4	3	2
No	27	25	22	33
No response	1	0	0	4

4. Has this student had work experience with SSP this year?

Yes	28	24	20	33
No	8	4	5	6
No response	1	1	0	0

5. Has this student been in an alternative school this year?

	North N=37	South N=29	Franklin N=25	Phillips N=39
Yes	20	2	2	3
No	16	26	23	35
No response	1	1	0	1

6. What is this student's plan for next year?

Return to school	15	17	23	33
Drop out of school (don't know what they will do)	3	2	0	0
Drop out of school (try to get a job)	2	0	0	0
Planning to take the G.E.D.	0	1	0	0
Don't know	6	5	1	6
Other	11	2	1	0
No response	0	2	0	0

It appears that SSP staff members at North High School seem less sure that the SSP students there will graduate from high school than do the South SSP staff. This may be partially because many of the North students are in ninth grade and are more comparable to the junior high SSP distributions. A majority of these students have had some work experience during the year, and many of the North High students have been in some alternative school arrangement. (This large proportion is primarily a function of the S.O.S. program within the North High building.) Most of the students referred to alternate schools from the other buildings were not maintained as SSP students.

Personal interviews with 65 of the SSP students were also conducted by aides or social workers. They were asked to identify aspects of the program that helped them most and

asked to comment about the things they thought were best or poorest in SSP. The work component was mentioned positively most frequently. They feel it helped them--gave them spending money and work experience--and they liked pay day! A number of students indicated that they liked the activities--i.e., trips, roller skating, etc.--but that there were fewer activities this year than in previous years.

In addition the students were asked to respond to the same last question that was asked the aide/social worker as to their plan for next year (SSP staff filled out their questionnaire prior to contacting the student). Students tended to say that they would continue in school. For the students who were interviewed the SSP staff were less optimistic about the probability of the student's reenrollment. The distribuiton of students' responses to this question are listed below:

What do you plan to do next year?

	North N=18	South N=12	Franklin N=11	Phillips N=24
Return to school	15	7	11	23
Drop out of school (don't know what they will do)	0	0	0	0
Drop out of school (try to get a job)	0	2	0	0
Planning to take the G.E.D.	0	1	0	0
Don't know	2	1	0	0
Other	1	1	0	0
No response	0	0	0	1

This review procedure was considered as an attempt to survey current SSP students about their attitudes toward the general program. In a few cases the parent was also contacted.

Generally, the parents and the students experesed positive attitudes toward the program. The provision of paid work experience was by far the most frequently mentioned item.

Budget

The yearly budget was approximately $500,000. This final year was slightly above this figure since the impounded funds of the previous year were released for use this year. (Some State of Minnesota reimbursements were used to supplement federal funds for certain social service employees.)

INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

On the following pages are listed the project objectives, grouped into Overall, Educational, Student and Family Support, and Work Experience Component Objectives. Within these four groups the objectives are further divided in Process and Product Objectives. Process objectives are those that are concerned with the ways in which the project is implemented; i.e., process for hiring staff, maintaining records, etc. The product objectives relate to behavioral changes observed for the participants; i.e., dropout rate, job attendance rates, etc.

Each objective is listed on a separate page, followed by the status of the information for the present school year, for the total four year period, as well as a listing of the pertinent data. Another section labeled "Discussion" presents such things as interpretations of the data, explanations of the problems associated with these data, and trends observed over the years of the project. The final portion of the material related to an objective is entitled "recommendations." This section involves the evaluator's judgment as to the overall effectiveness of the project in relation to the objective and suggestions as to what the Minneapolis schools could do to react to the situation revealed by these data.

OVERALL OBJECTIVES

OVERALL

Process Objective Number 1

Objective:

The number and assignment of project staff will be listed for each school.

Status this year:

This objective was essentially met. The following personnel were on the SSP staff during the 1974-75 school year:

Student Support Office

1 project manager
1 clerk-typist
2 intermittent consultants
1 evaluator
2 evaluation staff

South High School

1 building coordinator
1 social worker
1 job developer
2 teachers
5 school-community social worker aides
1 clerk

Phillips Junior High School

1 building coordinator
1 social worker
1 teacher
6 school-community social worker aides
1 clerk

North High-Franklin Junior High Schools

1 job developer
2 social workers
2 teachers
8 school-community social worker aides
1 community service representative

Four year status:

The SSP staffing pattern over the years has been changed. The changes include a general reduction of teachers on the staff and minor increases in school coordinators. As the final program year drew to a close, there were some position vacancies. In the last two years the North-Franklin staff provided services to SSP students at both North High and Franklin Junior High. In the last year there was a reduction of teachers (by one at Franklin and one at Phillips), which has speeded up the anticipated process of returning students to the regular academic program. The number of social workers has been increased to respond to the need for more social services for students. One social worker was assigned to each school, with the social worker at Phillips Junior High assigned there only half time.

Last year the Coordinator positions were half-time slots; this year they were essentially full time positions. More timely on-site decisions could be made than previously was the case. Improved communications between school administrators and teachers and SSP staff was reported at all sites.

Discussion:

Project administrators have adjusted staff assignments over the four years of the project to improve SSP performance. The appointment of school coordinators seemed to improve the frequency and quality of the regular staff-SSP staff interactions at each school.

There was a major change in the pay scale (and job title) of the social worker aide job during the third year of the program. This change reduced the turnover problem among the aides so that most of these paraprofessionals were experienced workers during the final year of the project.

Since the staff recognized that this was the last year of the program, there was a considerable amount of concern about finding subsequent employment. A certain amount of energy

was diverted toward finding such employment. As one might expect, this problem negatively affects attitudes of staff members. Some staff members accepted a job during this school year to ensure employment for the coming year.

Recommendations:

The present policy of hiring replacements for non-certified staff for federal programs through the Minneapolis Civil Service is often a time-consuming procedure which leaves positions unfilled during critical periods. A description of this problem with some suggestions for changes are included in the Appendix.

OVERALL

Process Objective Number 2

Objective:

The physical facilities provided for the program at each site will be described and evaluated.

Status this year:

This objective was added this year, although the topic has been discussed in previous reports. Over the years of the program, there have been changes in the physical space provided, usually increasing the size and quality.

Four year status:

Although initially there were a number of problems with SSP space allocations in each shcool, acceptable resolutions were made. The physical facilities for the Student Support Program are still of variable quality in the schools. At North High School one small office serves as headquarters for the program. Although SSP does not provide remedial education courses for the North SSP students, the space problem makes individual conferences between the student and his aide, social worker or job developer essentially impossible. Such conferences held in the office are public by necessity, which discourages many students who need private counseling. When privacy is required, conferences must be held in the halls or outside of the school. Staff conferences are normally held in a nearby teacher's lounge area.

At Franklin Jr. High an office and two classrooms have been utilized. One of these classrooms was built in a hall recess, which is satisfactory during some portions of the year. During cold weather (with the energy crisis) hall areas were heated to only 60°, and this classroom was unusable.

At South High School two offices and three classrooms were provided. This contiguous space proved quite satisfactory.

At Phillips Jr. High the physical space was improved tremendously over the previous inadequate facility. The refurbishing of the former gym and locker room space provided one large room and two offices for SSP facilities. Partitions were used to provide classroom and conference space within the large room. In addition, the room was newly carpeted during the fall, making the room warm and pleasant.

Recommendations:

Ideally, the program could use an office for staff work and small conference rooms for individual contacts between staff members and students as well as small classrooms for group instruction. Each school has individual problems in providing space.

OVERALL

Process Objective Number 3

Objective:

Records will be maintained at each school of the SSP student selection process.

Status this year:

This objective is generally not met, although few new students were selected for the program this year.

Four year status:

The staff documentation of the student selection process has been spotty. When the program was initiated, the selection of students was often done on the recommendation of building principals, assistant principals, teachers, counselors, etc. A more formal screening and staffing procedure was developed which involved the coordination of the SSP staff and the regular school staff. This joint staffing of potential participants in the program was generally not well documented. The selection process was much more thoughtfully done, however.

Discussion:

The return of the school-community social worker aides during August of 1974 allowed for a great improvement in the review and selection process of SSP students for the year 1974-75. Meetings were held during August to review the folders of each student who would be kept in SSP from last year, and to staff them effectively.

Major areas of priority were aiding students in the movement from junior high to high school and in providing continuing service to students previously served by SSP. In the high school, efforts were generally placed on continuing SSP students rather than on adding new students to the program. At

Franklin Junior High emphasis was placed on eighth grade students who would benefit from guidance concerning their anticipated move to North High next year. In general, fewer new students were selected this year than in previous years due to the impending close of the project.

A new review and referral procedure was introduced at Phillips Junior High. This procedure seemed to work quite well and seemed to improve communications between teachers and SSP staff concerning SSP student needs. The Pupil Personnel Team (PPT), a voluntary team of interested staff members, met regularly to review folders and records of students whose names had been submitted as possible participants in any special programs at Phillips. Referrals might come from staff, parents or the students themselves. The PPT did a needs assessment of the student and reviewed his record to eliminate overlapping services. In the case of an SSP referral, if the student was approved by PPT, his name was then referred back to SSP for final approval. This process has done a great deal to eliminate arbitrary referral of behavior problems into SSP, has allowed cooperative evaluation between staffs and has sustained SSP as the final authority in accepting or rejecting students.

Pupil plans from last year were of great assistance in staffing students this year. Records of the selection process are spotty and incomplete.

Recommendations:

Since the program was to be phased out at the end of this school year, the record keeping phase of this objective was not considered as critical as it was in previous years. One of the major difficulties in evaluating the overall SSP impact is related to the problem of documenting specific selection criteria used in each school. Since very few new students were added to the program during this project year, emphasis was placed on successfully phasing students into the regular school program.

OVERALL

Process Objective Number 4

Objective:

General school attendance will be monitored for each student at the end of each quarter or trimester.

Status this year:

The table below presents general school attendance for SSP students at Franklin Jr. High and North and South High schools for the 1974-75 school year. (The school attendance information for Phillips and the second trimester at North is not shown. Although these data were scheduled to be obtained, when it was discovered that the information had not been recorded, the offices and records were not available.)

SSP Students Present

Percentage of Days	Franklin			North		South		
	Trimester			Trimester		Trimester		
	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
91-100	8	9	5	12	3	12	12	9
81-90	3	7	8	3	6	19	15	9
71-80	5	5	4	3	8	12	15	9
61-70	5	2	4	3	3	10	2	2
51-60	1	0	2	3	4	8	4	6
41-50	2	0	1	6	1	6	2	4
31-40	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	4
21-30	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	5
11-20	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0
0-10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
not attending*	0	3	3	5	14	5	3	7
TOTAL	25	27	28	38	49	76	54	55

*See footnote on following page

Four year status:

One of the selection criteria for SSP students has been poor school attendance. An inspection of the four year trends in SSP school attendance is complicated by several factors. Over the years of the project the Minneapolis Schools have been changing from a semester to a trimester system. In the project schools South High has used the trimester system for the last two years. North High and Franklin Junior High changed to the trimester system this year. At Phillips the semester system has been used throughout. In addition, changes from modular to regular class scheduling at South High after the second year and changes in homeroom assignments (first class of the day) at both South and North High make some of the comparisons of questionable value. However, the process objective of monitoring attendance has technically been met except for the currently missing data at North High and Phillips Junior High Schools for this last year.

Discussion:

Records are kept at each school of general school attendance. These records form the basis of state reimbursement to the public schools. School attendance and class attendance are not necessarily the same thing. A student may report to homeroom and be counted as present at school but attend few or none of the scheduled classes for that day. Another student may be absent for the homeroom session in the morning but arrive at school, sign in as a tardy student and then attend all classes. In general, the SSP students have poor attendance records. It should also be noted that "excused" absences are included with the "unexcused" absences in the tallies.

---

*Students listed in the "not attending" category are still in the program but are attending alternate schools or are institutionalized. This category includes pregnant girls, students in juvenile detention facilities, etc. Some are receiving partial SSP services such as home visits, work component activities, etc.; others are expected back in school soon and have, therefore, not been dropped from the SSP roll.

An attempt was made to look at the trends in school attendance for SSP students. During the initial year of the project, school attendance was summarized to only show the percent of days all SSP students were listed as present. No distribution of individual attendance records was presented. The following table shows the percent of SSP students who were listed as being present in school for 71 or more percent of the days--that is, students who attended at least seven tenths of the time.

Percent of SSP Students Who
Attended 71% or More of the School Days

	Franklin	Phillips	South	North
2nd Year	76 67 54 53	67 51 59 43	55 51 47 31	XXX
3rd Year	77 73 76 41	60 65 57 45	* 61 51 32	42 42 26 18
4th Year	* 64 78 61	**	* 57 78 49	* 47 ** 35

* Trimester system
** Missing data
XXX Not a part of SSP during the year

The above table shows some improvement in school attendance this year. However, poor attendance is a continuing problem for these students.

The attendance pattern of the SSP students has both academic and social implications. Some students miss school with parental permission when a babysitter is needed for young children at home. Other parents leave for their work assuming that the children will get up and leave for school. Some SSP staff call at home, rouse the students and then drive them to school. These kinds of extraordinary procedures and conditions are effective for only a small number of SSP students. Grades, course credits and relationships with community and school authorities are affected by the poor attendance of these students. Many times the difference between a "dropout" and a

poor school attender is an administrative decision as to whether the student should be withdrawn. In general, administrators were probably more lenient with SSP students since the program could provide information about the reasons for poor attendance to the school office. The SSP staff was usually in contact with the student and the family and could anticipate the procedure used in withdrawing a student from the school. At times a court truancy statement was used to force better attendance for the under 16 year old SSP students.

OVERALL

Process Objective Number 5

Objective:

Project staff at each school will prepare a written set of goals of the program in working with each SSP student. This individual plan will be based upon the records of a student's previous activities and situation both in the school and outside.

Status this year:

This objective was not met.

Four year status:

This objective has been partially met. This objective was implied in the first year of the program as a mechanism for structuring staff activity with a student, the school and the family. The problems associated with staff documentation have plagued supervisors and the evaluation team over the life of the project. For most of the students on the program there was an informal plan developed (but not necessarily recorded) by the involved staff members. During the third year, substantial improvement was made in the documentation of the student plans. Before the final year of the project a staff training session was used to formally prepare plans. Although this seemed to work well, the revising of plans and utilization during the year was spotty. Overall, the use of formal program documentation in planning for student-program interactions was relatively meager.

Discussion:

The relatively complete student plans from last year were a strong supportive factor in the marked improvement in staffing and program planning at the beginning of this year. The

aides returned in August of 1974 to review student folders and to plan assignments for the coming year. Efforts were made to involve the aide, the social worker, the job developer, and, when possible, the student and parents in the program planning for each student.

During the early part of the year case review procedures improved. More often than in previous years the social worker reviewed folders with the aides to reassess planned programs for students. The use of pupil plans and case review procedures improved program continuity in working with students. However, as staff and students were anticipating being integrated into "regular school" activities, case reviews and specific interventions diminished.

A review of the student folders at the end of the year showed that individual plans were present for essentially all of the Franklin Junior High SSP students. At South High about 60% of the folders contained an active individual plan. The plans for students at North High and Phillips Junior High were less complete. With the problems associated with phasing out the program and assisting students in adjusting to the regular school routines, the staff has placed less emphasis on this aspect of planning for the student.

OVERALL

Product Objective Number 1

Objective:

Students enrolled in South High School in September 1973 will exhibit a dropout rate for 1974-75 of 19%, or 24% lower than the dropout rate for 1970-71 as measured by the Title VIII accountability formula.

Status this year:

The dropout rate for the 1974-75 school year was 25% This does not meet the stated objective.

Four year status:

The data presented below contains no compelling evidence that the dropout rates at either South or North High Schools has changed materially. In the evaluator's judgment the impact of SSP on the overall dropout rate has been minimal. However, some students who have been in the program undoubtedly would have left school earlier if the program never existed.

Discussion:

The following table presents the South High School dropout data for the last six years:

Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate
1969-70	318	26%
1970-71	423	28%
1971-72	335	22%
1972-73	350	24%
1973-74	278	22%
1974-75	325	25%

It should be noted that some students withdraw, re-enroll and then withdraw again. In this case they are counted as two dropouts. Although this inflates the dropout figures slightly, the overall interpretation is not affected.

A similar listing of dropouts for North High School was made. (North High and South High are comparable inner city schools; however, SSP has given only partial services to students at North.) The North High dropout rate for 1974-75 was 16%. This is lower than for the previous three years (23%, 27% and 20%). However, North High moved into a new building during the 1973-74 school year. It currently includes 9th grade students that in previous years were in various junior high schools. Therefore, the comparability of these data is questionable.

Dropout rates for these two high schools is quite high in comparison to most high schools in the city. These schools were selected for this program because of their dropout rates. Slight fluctuations in dropout rate are observed; however, it seems that one effect SSP has had in these schools is to delay the time a student drops out of school. In the long run this would not affect the overall dropout rate. General economic factors related to job availability probably have as much effect on high school dropout rates as do special school programs.

General discussion of dropout statistics:

Although at first glance the concept of school dropout seems to be clear and unequivocal, the actual procedural definitions required raise many questions and doubts as to the specific usefulness of "dropout" statistics. The overall definition considers the initial enrollment in a school then those enrolled at the end of the school year, with the difference being the "dropouts." However, adjustments must be made in all of these figures to account for enrollment changes that are not considered dropouts -- for example, students who "transfer" in and/or out of the school system to or from other schools, students who leave school because of hospitalization,

death, entry into a penal institution, etc. At the time these students leave school it is not known whether this is a temporary or permanent withdrawal. Transfers of students from one school to another within the same system are usually excluded from the dropout list. Although a student who has difficulty in one school may be formally listed as being on an alternative school roll, formal follow-up as to whether the student is attending the alternative school is problematical. (This poses another set of issues in the definition of a dropout. Namely, what attendance criteria should be used to decide that a person is "enrolled in school"?)

Public school systems have definitions as to attendance requirements for students. (Students under 16 years of age are usually required by law to be enrolled in school.) Rules for "dropping" students who are more than 16 are on the books. These usually permit considerable discretion by school authorities and are variously used as a function of administrative decisions based upon problems the student causes for other students and school staff. This permits relaxation of rules for special cases or special projects.

Another consideration is related to reimbursement procedures of the school system. Therefore, a student who is a "poor attender" is more likely to be dropped from the school rolls if 1) he/she is difficult to manage in the halls, classroom or school grounds; 2) the state reimbursement procedure is based on average daily attendance rather than average enrollment; 3) if the student and parents are unlikely to contest the procedure etc. The student is less likely to be dropped if he/she is being intensively worked with on a special project or if the administrator knows extenuating circumstances. The above comments are not intended to be critical of the exercise of administrative judgment in making decisions about dropping students but are intended to describe the variability of dropout statistics that are under the control of school administration.

Another category of dropouts that should be discussed briefly is often labelled by student proponents as school "push-outs." Few public school administrators would officially admit to encouraging students to leave school by utilizing rules and procedures as road blocks to continuing in school. However, most observers would agree that this is done; and many would consider it appropriate in some of the instances.

All of the above situations affect the dropout statistics listed in this report. The data reported are the official school listings. In a few cases SSP students who are listed as withdrawing in a non dropout category (e.g., transfer to non-public school or moved out of district) are known by SSP staff to be functionally "out of school." The students probably told school personnel that they were going to move to another town or "to the reservation" etc.; however, they are still living in the Minneapolis school area and should be listed as dropouts. Comparisons between years, schools and school districts in terms of "dropout" percentages is hazardous. The effectiveness of follow-up procedures and the use of administrative judgment in processing the dropout lists can insert variability into these proportions.

Recommendations:

In the four years of the project some of the areas of concern presumably related to dropout have been delineated. However, key factors that can be demonstrated to be related to dropping out of school are difficult to identify in a way that prevention measures can be instituted. From SSP student responses the work component and the provision of a "comfortable" place to relate problems are two key areas. The overall problem of disaffection with the schools for students who drop out did not develop within four years, and no specific panaceas were uncovered during the course of this program.

OVERALL

Product Objective Number 2

Objective:

Students enrolled in Franklin Junior High School in September of 1974 will exhibit a dropout rate for 1974-75 of 3%, or 25% lower than the dropout rate for 1969-70 as measured by the Title VIII accountability formula.

Status this year:

This objective was technically met; however, since ninth graders were not in Franklin the last two years, the data are not comparable. If the project were going to continue next year, this objective would have been deleted.

Four year status:

The objectives of reducing junior high school dropout rates would be appropriate only if there were enough students of age 16, so that a reasonable proportion could legally withdraw.

Discussion:

For the 1973-74 and 1974-75 school years Franklin Junior High included only 7th and 8th graders. In previous years of the SSP, 9th grade was also a part of Franklin. The new North High School includes grades 9-12 rather than the 10-12th grade in previous years. Therefore, the dropout data for Franklin the last two years is not comparable to previous data. Since the North High 9th grade includes students from several junior high schools, no direct estimate of the dropout rate for these students could be made. Dropout from junior high schools is infrequent (few students have reached the age of 16); therefore, the loss of comparable data at Franklin Junior High is not considered to be serious for the overall evaluation of the program.

The table below shows the recorded dropout rate for 1969 to the present:

Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate
1969-70	17	4%
1970-71	17	4%
1971-72	11	2%
1972-73	17	2%
1973-74	2*	1%
1974-75	4*	1%

*Note: Ninth grade not included.

OVERALL

Product Objective Number 3

Objective:

Students enrolled in Phillips Junior High School in September will exhibit a dropout rate no higher than 4% for the school year as measured by the Title VIII accountability formula.

Status this year:

The overall dropout rate for the current school year was 3%. This meets the objective.

Four year status:

This objective has been met each year.

Discussion:

The withdrawal of 22 Phillips students represents a reduction in dropouts from the base year. The table below presents these data:

Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate
1969-70	46	6%
1970-71	38	5%
1971-72	34	5%
1972-73	17	3%
1973-74	19	4%
1974-75	22	3%

Junior high students tend to have a lower withdrawal rate since state law requires school attendance until age 16. Few of the junior high students attain that age in ninth grade.

There seems to be a reduction in the number of Phillips students who drop out. This may reflect administrative decisions and provision of alternative programs as well as SSP.

EDUCATION COMPONENT OBJECTIVES

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 1

Objective:

Class attendance records for all high school SSP students will be reported.

Status this year:

This objective was essentially met this year. Due to a problem with retrieving second trimester grade reports at North High, their class attendance is provided for only the first and third trimester.

Four year status:

Class attendance problems were one of the measures used to identify students who should be a part of SSP. Comparisons from year to year are somewhat complicated by the change from the quarter-semester system to the trimester system. The high school grade cards for the last two years have reported class attendance. Prior to that class attendance was obtained only for SSP classes.

Discussion:

Since most students are enrolled in 4-6 courses, the frequencies tallied will be much larger than the number of students on the SSP rolls. However, attendance is not always listed for courses that a student fails or receives a "no credit." This has been tallied as "not reported."

The attendance records kept by the teachers do not reflect "excused" absences but are simply a record of presence or absence in the class. Many of the courses given by SSP teachers are tailored to individual needs and therefore tend to be task oriented. Therefore, one student may complete an

assigned task in fewer class hours than some other student. This makes class attendance less critical in the eyes of both student and instructor.

The following table shows SSP student class attendance at South High and North High for the 1974-75 school year:

Number of Students Attending Classes

Percent Attendance	South			North			
	Trimester			Trimester			
	1	2	3	1	2	3	
91-100	34	49	10	32		22	
81-90	61	37	29	33		19	
71-80	37	21	20	8		12	
61-70	39	23	19	3		11	
51-60	10	7	17	2		10	
41-50	9	2	9	0		7	
31-40	3	9	6	0		7	
21-30	1	3	5	0		5	
11-20	0	7	3	0		8	
0-10	0	2	5	0		16	
not reported	1	25	58	2		14	

Comparable data for the 1973-74 school year is presented below:

Percent Attendance	South			North			
	Trimester			Quarter			
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
91-100	14	19	9	27	17	12	3
81-90	18	27	25	12	13	17	4
71-80	26	17	15	15	19	5	8
61-70	10	40	38	12	9	1	7
51-60	12	14	10	19	9	7	9
41-50	3	9	14	20	19	11	10
31-40	8	3	5	8	9	8	6
21-30	2	1	1	7	5	7	7
11-20	5	2	7	8	9	12	8
0-10	6	5	3	0	26	14	20
not reported	9	20	22	2	21	5	1

This is an apparent improvement in attendance this year. However, some of this could be due to the increase in the number of teachers who chose not to report attendance when the student did not obtain credit in the course. The major trend shown in these data, however, is that for these students attendance is poorer as the year progresses.

Class attendance is a continuing problem for these students. Attendance records kept by the teachers tend to be somewhat variable in quality. Changes in class attendance are affected by both record keeping and time of year.

The program had some marked successes with individual students in terms of improved class attendance. However, other SSP students counteracted this so that no overall trend was established.

It is the evaluator's judgment that SSP had some effect to both improve and degrade recorded class attendance. The SSP office was at times used as a refuge to escape going to a class. In spite of staff attempts to insist on class attendance, it was not always successful.

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 2

Objective:

Teachers will record the use of special community resource people, specialized minority history curriculum materials and special field trips in connection with the educational program.

Status this year:

This objective has been met this year with a slight improvement in documentation of these activities from previous years.

Four year status:

This objective has been met. Social worker aides and teachers have organized field trips to points of interest in the Twin Cities area. In addition, a few community resource people have been brought into the schools to discuss various problems with the students.

Discussion:

The use of special curriculum materials has been minimal throughout the program; however, the activities associated with field trips are reported as relatively effective in providing supplemental information for the classroom and motivating students. These trips also provide a time and place for teachers, aides and other staff to interact with students in an informal out of school atmosphere.

A special activity involving the regular school staff at Phillips Junior High School was partially sponsored by SSP. This involved an orientation concerned with "Indian Culture," primarily conducted by Native Americans in the school and the community. A report of this orientation course is included in

the Appendix. As a partial result of this course, an Indian Culture course was offerred at Phillips for the students. This course consisted of American Indian history, arts and crafts, etc. Some SSP staff assisted in the organization and conduct of the course.

Each year SSP has used Indian Week activities as a focus for a number of field trips. During July, 1974, a special field trip was organized for about 15 students to go to Pipestone National Monument. This activity involves these students in extracting this historically significant stone at a quarry. High school social studies credit was given for the involvement of these Indian students in this traditional activity.

Overall, the use of field trips and recreational activities has been more a part of SSP than has the use of special curriculum materials or outside resource people.

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 3

Objective:

Records will be kept to monitor the progress of project students in making grade level advancements. At South High and North High the receipt of credits toward grade level advancement and ultimate graduation will be monitored.

Status this year:

This objective has essentially been met for the 1974-75 school year. Although grades for the 2nd semester were not obtained for Phillips Junior High students, essentially all of the SSP 9th grade students are permitted to progress to the 10th grade. The third trimester grade cards for North High students show their cumulative credits.

Four year status:

This objective has been met.

Discussion:

The tables on the following pages reflect progress of SSP students in their courses during the 1974-75 year and for previous years. At North and South High Schools "normal" progress toward graduation requires 5.0 credits per trimester (15 credits per year). In previous years at North High and in 1972-73 at South High the semester system was used. This required 2.5 credits per quarter and 10 credits per year for "normal" progress. At the junior high schools no comparable credit system is used.

Distribution of Credits Received
by SSP Students at South High School
1972-73

Number of Credits Received	Number of SSP Students			
	Quarter			
	1 (N=85)	2 (N=76)	3 (N=81)	4 (N=68)
2.50 and above	6	10	14	7
1.50 - 2.25	11	15	16	12
.50 - 1.25	35	29	20	23
.00 - .25	28	21	27	21
credits not reported*	5	1	4	5

Distribution of Credits Received
by SSP Students at South High School
1973-74

Number of Credits Received	Number of SSP Students		
	Semester		
	1 (N=57)	2 (N=65)	3 (N=65)
5 and above	19	24	15
3-4	18	13	21
1-2	14	19	16
0	4	5	6
credits not reported*	2	4	7

*Grades and credits are not reported for students in institutions, alternative schools, etc.

Distribution of Credits Received
by SSP Students at North High School
1973-74

Number of Credits Received	Number of SSP Students			
	Quarter			
	1 (N=40)	2 (N=40)	3 (N=39)	4 (N=39)
2.50 and above	5	4	4	4
1.50 - 2.25	7	12	11	7
.50 - 1.25	10	5	4	6
.00 - .25	5	10	9	9
credits not reported*	13	9	11	13

Distribution of Credits Received
by SSP Students at South High School
1974-75

Number of Credits Received	Number of SSP Students		
	Semester		
	1 (N=76)	2 (N=54)	3 (N=55)
5 and above	25	21	22
3-4	20	11	10
1-2	18	15	10
0	12	5	10
credits not reported*	1	2	3

*Grades and credits are not reported for students in institutions, alternative schools, etc.

Distribution of Credist Received
by SSP Students at North High School
1974-75

Number of Credits Received	Number of SSP Students		
	Semester		
	1 (N=38)	2 **	3 (N=46)
5 and above	5		7
3-4	10		4
1-2	11		9
0	8		17
credits not reported*	4		9

*Grades and credits are not reported for students in institutions, alternative schools, etc.

**Grade cards not obtained.

South High School

Considerable progress toward increasing the number of SSP students making "normal progress" toward graduation can be seen by studying the tables showing credits received by SSP students. In the 1972-73 school year South High School used a modular class scheduling system. Fewer SSP students made normal progress toward graduation that year. There has been a progressive increase in the next two years, although much less than one half of the students made this normal progress goal. (Comparable data is not available for the initial year of the program.)

North High School

At North High School SSP has been active for the past two years. The program teachers have not offerred courses in this school. "Normal" progress is being made by fewer of these SSP students than is the case at South High. The previous table shows the distribution of credits for the two years.

It should be noted that the North SSP program includes 9th graders. (At South only grades 10-12 are enrolled.) In last year's evaluation report concern was expressed related to the necessity of 9th graders obtaining 15 trimester credits in order to make progress toward 10th grade, when most 9th graders housed in the junior high schools receive a promotion to 10th grade even if they "fail" several courses. There were 14 SSP students enrolled in 9th grade this year at North High. Of these, 3 obtained 15 or more credits (normal progress); 2 obtained 10-14 credits; 7 showed 5-9 credits on their final report card; and 2 students had less than 5 credits. For many of these 9th graders the possibility of graduating in four years is relatively remote. However, some students, by going to summer school and taking extra courses during each year, could recover from these deficits. For most SSP students this is not too likely.

Distributions of current levels of credit were made for all SSP students at North and South High Schools. At each grade level a student's progress was classified as to whether they are making Normal Progress (i.e., 15 or more credits for the first year in high school; 30 or more for the second year, etc.). Marginal Progress is the label used for 10-14 credits during the first year. Additional Time Required is the label used for fewer credits than indicated in the lower limit of the marginal group. (A few students, those registered in alternate school programs, did not have a cumulative credit notation on their report cards. Therefore, the total number of students will not agree with other distributions in this report.)

North High Credits for SSP Students

	Normal Progress		Marginal Progress		Additional Time Required	
9th Grade	(15+)	3	(10-14)	2	(0-9)	10
10th Grade	(30+)	1	(25-29)	2	(10-24)	12
11th Grade	(45+)	0	(43-44)	0	(25-42)	1
12th Grade	(60+)	0	*		under 57	1
Total		4		4		27

South High Credits for SSP Students

	Normal Progress		Marginal Progress		Additional Time Required	
10th Grade	(15+)	4	(10-14)	7	(0-9)	12
11th Grade	(30+)	1	(28-29)	3	(10-27)	10
12th Grade	(45+)	5	*		(28-44)	4
Total		10		10		26

*This category of marginal progress in 12th grade is really not applicable, since if the student does not have sufficient credits to graduate, they, by definition, require additional time in school. In other grades they may be able to obtain extra credits during the next school year.

These distributions show that very few North High SSP students are making normal progress. At South High more students have a chance to obtain a diploma in three years; however, a larger group will require at least one extra year in high school.

SSP Junior High Schools

The junior high school program generally is not oriented toward the accumulation of specific course credits. If students achieve reasonable grades in most quarters (trimesters) in "key" courses, they are generally permitted to enter the 10th grade high school program. However, as noted in the previous section, at North High the transition from junior high "credits" to high school required credit is made at the 9th grade rather than the 10th grade level.

At the junior high schools a much larger proportion of the students pass their courses and are, therefore, making normal progress toward entering high school. The distributions of courses passed at both Franklin and Phillips show minor changes in performance, with the last trimester or quarter grades being somewhat poorer. This has been the pattern each year of the program.

The distributions of courses passed at Franklin and Phillips Junior High Schools this year is shown in the following table. It should be stated again that the Franklin SSP group is only 7th and 8th graders. This younger group tends to pass a greater proportion of their courses.

Although these data do not show the Phillips second semester grades, it is the understanding of the SSP staff members that essentially all of the Phillips SSP students on the roll at the end of the year are being promoted to 10th grade.

Distribution of Courses Passed

FRANKLIN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Percentage of Courses Passed	Number of SSP Students		
	Trimester		
	1 (N=25)	2 (N=27)	3 (N=28)
100%	10	7	6
75% - 99%	6	7	5
50% - 74%	3	7	8
25% - 49%	5	2	4
0% - 24%	1	1	2
grades not recorded*	0	3	3

PHILLIPS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

Percentage of Courses Passed	Number of SSP Students	
	Quarter	
	1 (N=47)	2 (N=47)
100%	21	12
75% - 99%	6	11
50% - 74%	8	12
25% - 49%	4	5
0% - 24%	6	2
grades not recorded*	2	5

*Grades and credits are not reported for students in institutions, alternative schools, etc.

**Second semester grades (quarters 3 and 4) not obtained.

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Product Objective Number 1

Objective:

The minimum goal for 95% of the students enrolled in any SSP class is an attendance rate of 25%.

Status this year:

Formal SSP classes have been reduced over the years as the number of teachers has been reduced. At South High some SSP courses were conducted. The attendance in these courses met the above 25% attendance criterion--the percent of students attending more than 25% of the class sessions was 96%, 100% and 97% for the three trimesters.

Four year status:

This objective has not been met each year.

Discussion:

In previous years class attendance in SSP classes has been monitored. At South High formal courses have been conducted by SSP teachers for only the last two years. During the third year the proportion of students attending SSP classes over 25% of the time was 86%, 98% and 93% for the three trimesters. During the fourth year the better attendance is shown above. However, it should be noted that class attendance is not necessarily reported on the grade cards if the student receives no credit (N.C.) in the course. Therefore, the above figures may be somewhat misleading. Frequently, a "no credit" grade essentially means that the student didn't attend the class. Almost one fourth of the SSP students enrolled in these classes received a "no credit" grade during the 1974-75 school year. (At North High School there have been no classes taught by SSP staff members.)

At the junior high level a number of courses (and formal tutoring) were conducted during the 1972-73 school year; fewer classes were conducted in 1973-74. SSP class attendance has been above the 25% criterion for between 80-98% of the students enrolled in these courses during the two years.

Since high school grade cards record class attendance, Process Objective I related to class attendance presents a better picture of the overall class attendance problem. These students at both junior high and senior high level generally have poor class attendance records. School and class attendance are a part of the basic selection criteria for SSP. Improvement in class attendance can be documented for some individuals, but for the SSP students as a group, attendance is a continuing problem.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT OBJECTIVES

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 1

Objective:

Student Support Program students who can be identified as dropouts from the project schools will be given an exit interview when possible.

Status this year:

Relatively few exit interviews were obtained this year.

Four year status:

Most of the SSP dropouts have not been interviewed after they left school.

Discussion:

The exit interviews that have been done over the course of the project have not uncovered much new information about these students. Sometimes these interviews persuade students to stay in school. Reasons given by these students for leaving school include: wanted to get a job, moving out of the district, don't like school, enrolling in another school-work program, and pregnancy. Informal information from friends or relatives has been more helpful to the program. Frequently students who drop out are persuaded to reenroll at some later date. The personal contact by SSP staff and general assurance that they would be accepted in SSP if they reenroll seem to be effective.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 2

Objective:

The social worker at each school will coordinate records of home visits and other parent contacts. A written report of all of these parent contacts will be maintained in the SSP files.

Status this year:

Records of parent contacts have generally been filed in student folders.

Four year status:

Maintaining complete and accurate files of the home visits and other parent contacts has been a continuing problem. Improvement in the completeness of the files probably has been made, although it is difficult to generate data to confirm this assertion.

Discussion:

The following table indicates the number of documented parent contacts made during the 1974-75 school year for the students who were on the roll at the end of the year.

The table shows the minimum number of parent contacts made. Parent contacts made for students who have withdrawn from SSP by transferring to the regular program, by transferring to another school or by dropping out of school at some time during the school year are not included. In addition, many contacts made with parents are not formally documented, even though such documentation would be desirable. For example, SSP staff members may talk to a parent about a student's progress and problems at an evening class or at an informal social gathering. The aide may not perceive the contact as

being particularly important, even though such a contact may be of value to the parent or the student. Some such contacts are documented; others are not.

School	Number of SSP Students on Roll	Total Number of Parent Contacts	% of Students Receiving at Least One Parent Contact
Franklin			
1st trimester	25	70	84%
2nd trimester	27	80	85%
3rd trimester	28	78	82%
North			
1st trimester	38	140	97%
2nd trimester	49	104	79%
3rd trimester	49	49	55%
Phillips			
1st semester	47	75	82%
wnd semester	45	27	24%
South			
1st trimester	76	198	79%
2nd trimester	54	37	33%
3rd trimester	55	52	36%

The problem of getting documented parent contacts for all staff interactions with these parents has been difficult, particularly in the light of recent court rulings giving students and parents access to student files. At times information is collected or judgments made that the staff personnel do not want to put in the file for reference of the entire staff or the parents. Data on suspected drug use, family and social problems, etc. may be omitted. Further, some of the aides

are parents of students in SSP, making some aides even less willing to submit confidential information to these files since the files are easily accessible to other staff members. The balance between complete documentation and respect for the confidential nature of some information is the basic responsibility of the social worker and overall has been handled well.

A program goal was for all SSP students in the Social or Educational Components to have a minimum of one home visit per quarter (or trimester). Those students who are on the Work Experience Component only recieve a home visit when requested by the parent or when a staff member feels it would be helpful. Students who are judged to need more contacts may receive many home visits during the term. However, the general goal of a parent contact per trimester was not obtained this year, and during the third trimester the number of parent contacts was quite low.

One of the difficulties with the frequent home visits is that parents may get irritated by too many home visits. This is especially a problem when a parent has children in SSP at more than one site, thus bringing aides or social workers from two schools to their door. Efforts were made to avoid multiple visits of this sort.

Comparisons of parent contacts in previous years show that the proportion of SSP student homes visited (or parents contacted) range from 60% to 97%. The comparability of these data can be questioned on several bases. During the first year only staff visits to the students' homes were counted as being acceptable for the objective. Subsequently, all parent contacts were counted whether they took place in school, at the home, or in a chance meeting in the community. Also, the accuracy of the records varied form year to year. Case review procedures were more frequently done during the last two years of the program. Some parent contacts which should have been recorded on special forms were not recorded in that fashion but rather included in case review materials. The number

of these contacts that are included in the tallies are undoubtedly variable.

During the last year of the program the community-social worker aides were generally experienced staff of SSP. They knew many of the parents and students. Uncooperative parents (or parents who punished their children because of information provided through SSP) received relatively few contacts. Parents of students who were adjusting well to school and the program also tended to receive fewer contacts.

The basic idea of involving more parents in the schools and providing them with a better understanding of the school was achieved for certain parents. There were also parents who resisted getting involved. The assumption that parents (or guardians) are intersted in the educational process for their children is probably a reasonable one; however, many of these parents have other overriding problems that interfere with their active involvement with a program like SSP.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 3

Objective:

Records will be kept of SSP staff contacts with community authorities in relation to SSP students.

Status this year:

This objective was essentially met.

Four year status:

Recording of these kinds of staff contacts has improved over the years of the project. In addition, the familiarity of the staff with persons in various social agencies has increased.

Discussion:

Social workers, teachers and/or social worker aides act as referral agents for SSP students and their families to social agencies. Staff have worked with community authorities whenever such a need is indicated. SSP staff also have made contacts with students in institutions outside the community boundaries. The new "open file" policy has seriously affected the willingness of staff members to document these types of activities. Many sensitive issues, especially those regarding interactions with police, parole officers or courts, personal, health or family problems are left out of the files as a protection to staff members and students alike.

Since difficulties affecting school success are often deeply interwoven with social problems beyond the school bounds, SSP staff have made efforts to be involved with outside agencies. Parole officers and judges have expressed their appreciation of the kind of information that SSP staff members provide for decisions on critical issues. Additionally, the support given

the student and family during periods of crisis has undoubtedly provided an alternative for the court other than a correctional institution. The fact that SSP staff will establish contact with a student every school day has been persuasive to these court officers.

Recommendations:

This type of service to SSP students has been a positive aspect of the program and should be continued by school authorities as much as possible. Documentation of these activities by SSP staff has not been as complete as is desirable.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 4

Objective:

Records will be kept of attendance at special evening courses offered for parents and students.

Status this year:

Only informal reporting of class attendance was done for most of these special sessions.

Four year status:

Overall involvement of parents in SSP activities has not been as universal as was originally desired. Sewing classes have been conducted for the last three years and have been well recieved by the participants. (The proportion of SSP families involved in the program has been relatively small.)

A buffalo dinner for SSP families and staff has been held in the winter each year. This activity has had a broader participation in the community.

Discussion:

In the 1974-75 school year evening sewing courses were offered for parents and students on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings at Phillips Junior High School. In these classes an instructor assisted parents and students in making clothes. Attendance was about 10 persons per session. This is essentially all that can be handled in class, since eight sewing machines were available. A buffalo dinner was held in December which was attended by about 350 parents, staff and students. This was a joint venture of SSP, the Indian Education Department and the Title IV Program. In the 1973-74 school year a driver training course was conducted for SSP

parents and students. Many of the parents participating in these events also were active in other SSP activities as parent aides, attending evening courses, etc. These programs seem to provide very enthusiastic response from the participants. As an attempt to involve parents in the general school program and in SSP particularly, they are quite successful, although the number of parents reached is limited.

The Title VIII schools have attempted to increase parental/community involvement in the school. Student Support has sponsored a variety of activities designed to bring parents to the school. For example, coffee and cake were offerred to Phillips SSP parents with an invitation to visit the school. This did not bring many of the parents to the school. However, the opening of discussions between all facets of the school and the community has started to develop more involvement by the community.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Product Objective Number 1

Objective:

A parent (or responsible adult supervisor) will give approval for his/her child to participate in the program.

Status this year:

The objective has been essentially met this year. Although a permission slip is not currently attached to all student files, a slip from each parent was obtained, and all parents were aware that their child was in the program.

Four year status:

The technical requirement to obtain permission slips has been a continued struggle for the SSP staff. During the last two years of the program essentially all students had a signed permission slip in their file.

Discussion:

The following table presents the number of signed permission slips in the SSP active files at each of the schools at the end of the year.

School	Number of Students on Roll	Number of Permission Slips Signed
Franklin	28	25
North	49	48
Phillips	45	42
South	55	51

The SSP staff members state that permission slips have been obtained for 100% of the SSP students. The table above shows only these permission slips that were actually seen in the general file by a member of the evaluation team. The discrepancy that exists in the schools can be attributed to several things. Some of the SSP students are on the Work Experience Component only, which does not require the presence of a permission slip in the student's general file; if there was an available slip in the job developer's folders, the student was considered to have a permission slip. Sometimes the permission slip may have been lost from the file at the time the evaluation staff audited the files. In a few cases the entire file was in the possession of an aide and was not available for inspection. Students who are over 18 could sign their own permission slip.

STUDENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT COMPONENT

Product Objective Number 2

Objective:

Reports summarizing alternative resources discovered and/or utilized will be recorded.

Status this year:

This objective has been only partially met this year.

Four year status:

Initially the program attempted to handle within the program essentially all situations that were considered to need specific interventions. However, some of the students' problems required referral through social agencies, school alternatives, etc. The original plan indicated that if a student required alternative resources that could not be handled by SSP and for which there was an available program, SSP would no longer maintain the student on their roll. However, many borderline situations occurred; e.g., commitment to a juvenile detention service for a short period of time, referral to an alternative school for a portion of each day, etc. It was considered appropriate for the SSP social work staff to maintain liaison with some students when they were in alternative school situations, which would ease the return of the student to the regular SSP activity. Over the years there was an increase in the number of students referred to alternative resources who received some SSP services.

Discussion:

A special effort was made early in the 1974-75 school year to provide a social worker in the central office who would be responsible for contacting alternative social and educational resources. Ideally, this person was to talk to

parents and students regarding these resources and talk with SSP staff about the most appropriate referral for students needing these resources. Many SSP students were considered for alternative educational programs during the year. Some of the alternative programs utilized included a school for pregnant girls, drug treatment and residential center, a diagnostic center, a corrections program, a youth advocate agency and store front alternative schools. Some students were sent by the courts to penal institutions. The documentation of these referrals is somewhat spotty. At least 27% of the students on SSP rolls at the end of this year were referred to alternative resources during the year. The exact number of other referrals has not been specifically recorded.

A listing of potential alternate resources associated with city and county government, churches or other federal programs has been available. This provided staff members with information about requirements for obtaining assistance and methods for initiating requests for service.

The individual who was responsible for acting as liaison between SSP staff members and alternative resources during the first four months of the 1974-75 school year obtained employment in another social agency in the area. The SSP staff handled these types of problems for themselves for the remainder of the year. Emphasis on this aspect of the program seems to have been reasonably effective over the years.

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 1

Objective:

The job developer will maintain records of SSP students who are working and those who want a job through the program.

Status this year:

This objective was met.

Four year status:

The work experience aspect of SSP has been a consistently popular one with students. The program has been increased over the years, since it seemed to provide useful training for many of the students.

Discussion:

The number of SSP students who state that they want jobs on the program has always been somewhat greater than the openings or the funds available. However, essentially all students who have been a part of SSP for at least a year and who have sincerely wanted the opportunity to work have been given that experience. Some students who have been working at a job decide they don't like that kind of work and ask the job developer to find them a "better" job. These kinds of requests are used by the job developer as learning experiences related to the world of work for the students. This accounts for a few of the students who indicate interest in working but are not continuously employed. Each year approximately 200 of the students have had a job through the program. During the summer of 1974 about 30 students were provided with employment. (In previous years no provision was made in the program for summer work.)

Recommendations:

It is hoped that many of the former SSP students can be included in the National Youth Corps work program at their schools. The evaluator understands that some work opportunities for students will be available through a continuation of a partial Student Support Program funded by some minor "carry over" funds.

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 2

Objective:

The work supervisors of SSP students will complete a student work rating form at least twice during the student's tenure on the job.

Status this year:

This objective has been partially met; the end of year ratings were more complete than in previous years.

Four year status:

Obtaining job rating forms from employers of these students has been somewhat difficult. The proportion of students for which evaluations of their work have been obtained was increased this year.

Discussion:

The table on the following page is based upon ratings given to student employees by their employers for this school year. These ratings show that employers are generally happy with the work performance of the students. The strongest areas of dissatisfaction are with attendance and with the students for not informing employers in case of absenteeism or tardiness. This pattern follows the pattern of previous years.

Comparisons of job performance for individuals early and later in the year were attempted several times during the course of the program. Since there is little variability in the rated performance, this was not successful in showing growth of the student on the job. Comments by supervisors were much more informative than changes in ratings.

JOB RATINGS

Item	Phillips N=32	South N=25	Franklin-North N=27
Appearance/Personal hygiene			
Acceptable	30	25	24
Marginal	2	0	3
Not Acceptable	0	0	0
Not Applicable	0	0	0
Ability to get along with supervisors/co-workers/customers			
Acceptable	27	25	25
Marginal	4	0	1
Not Acceptable	1	0	0
Omitted	0	0	1
Attendance/Tardiness			
Acceptable	15	21	15
Marginal	12	4	12
Not Acceptable	5	0	0
Informs employer in case of absence or tardiness			
Always	12	14	4
Usually	12	11	10
Never	7	0	13
Not Applicable	1	0	0
Willingness to accept and perform job duties			
Acceptable	24	25	22
Marginal	8	0	4
Not Acceptable	0	0	0
Omitted	0	0	1
Making improvement in actual job performance			
Acceptable	21	25	22
Marginal	10	0	4
Not Acceptable	1	0	0
Omitted	0	0	1

Although it seems reasonable to expect a supervisor to rate workers after 2-3 weeks on the job and again toward the end of their tenure on the job, it is often difficult for job developers to obtain completed rating sheets on their students. Employers are often busy or do not see the importance of providing the job developer with a completed rating sheet. In many cases the job developer used a telephone call to check on the progress of the student employee. Although in these cases the job developer has adequate information about the student's performance, no rating sheet can be filled out that provides a rating comparable to others obtained on the sheets.

Special Student Attitude Evaluation:

The job developer at Franklin Junior High and North High obtained information about student attitudes toward their work activities and the general work program. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 21 students; 10 Franklin students, 11 from North High. The questionnaire and the responses of these students are presented below.

1. Have you enjoyed working on the SSP work program?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10	11	0	0

2. Do you feel you have gained from your experience in the work program?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	14	1	0

3. Was your work coordinator fair in his dealings with you?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	15	1	0

4. Did he try to place you in a position you wanted or enjoyed?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	13	1	1

5. Did the work program have a favorable effect on your attitude toward school?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	7	5	4

6. What are your feelings toward a shortened school day?

Helpful	Sometimes Helpful	No Help
13	6	2

7. Was your money used for articles or things needed (clothing, etc.)?

Always	Sometimes	Never
8	13	0

8. Did the work program help keep you in school?

Yes	Probably	No
15	5	1

The students were then asked to write a comment about their work experiences. The comments were essentially all in appreciation of their job and of the SSP staff.

This job developer also summarized his impressions of the effect of the work component on each student who had a job and a judgment as to whether the student would persist toward a high school degree. In this man's judgment the jobs seem to have provided many of these students with a maturing experience that has increased the probability of their finishing high school. With appropriate adult support he feels most of these students will complete their high school education.

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

Process Objective Number 3

Objective:

The job developer will have permission slips signed by parents of SSP students who have jobs through the program.

Status this year:

Students must have permission slips signed before being given a job through the Work Experience Component. Therefore, this objective has been met, although the filing of these slips varies among the sites.

Four year status:

Specific permission slips for the job component have been utilized during the last two years.

Discussion:

Job attendance has been a problem for some SSP students. The parent permission slip has been used to involve both the home and the SSP staff to encourage better job attendance.

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

Product Objective Number 1

Objective:

Project students participating in the Work Experience Component will have an attendance average on the job of 80% of the work periods.

Status this year:

The objective was partially met.

Four year status:

Job attendance and school attendance is a continuing issue for SSP. Each year there have been students who have not met the 80% job attendance criterion.

Discussion:

The following table presents data of job attendance during the 1974-75 school year at the sites. It shows the number of students who were present on their job a given percent of the scheduled work periods.

Attendance on Jobs
1974-75

Percent	South			Phillips		Franklin-North		
	Trimester			Semester		Trimester		
	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
100	11	8	11	5	11	20	12	9
90-99	7	8	7	6	7	14	15	8
80-89	6	5	2	10	5	3	13	9
70-79	2	2	3	4	8	6	1	2
60-69	1	2	0	3	5	4	3	2
50-59	2	3	0	3	3	0	1	2
less than 50	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	1
	31	28	23	34	39	47	45	33

A yearly comparison of the proportion of students who worked at least 80% of their scheduled work periods is presented below. These distributions are somewhat difficult to compare since the semester, quarter and trimester systems were all used in recording this information.

Percent of SSP Students Attending Jobs
at Least 80% of the Work Periods

	1972-73 Quarter				1973-74			1974-75		
					Semester		Trimester	Semester		Trimester
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3
Phillips	56	62	67	60	38	65		62	59	
South	74	67	70	55	61	59	59	77	75	87
Franklin-North	83	59	69	60*	75	83		79	89	79

*Only Franklin in SSP this year.

Overall, there is a slight improvement over the years in terms of the proportion of students being present for their scheduled work periods. Dropping students from a job because of poor work attendance has been a continuing problem for job developers. A student who is not attending classes but is a consistent worker on the job is also a problem for the SSP staff. Should the student be dropped from the program because of poor school attendance, or will the regular attendance on the job finally result in more regular school attendance? The threat of losing the job has been effective in increasing class attendance for a few of these students, but such a threat is not always successful. In general, the job developers have evaluated each case to decide whether the student should be taken off his job because of poor school and/or job attendance. Of course, where work supervisors request that another student be placed on the job this request was honored.

APPENDIX

PROBLEMS OF URBAN INDIAN STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOLS*

In some of the inner-city schools in the Minneapolis Public School System the Indian students pose a problem for teachers and administrators. While other students complicate teachers' lives too, Indian students comprise a group that can be identified, and the generalization is often made that Indian students are "frequent" trouble makers. There is indirect data that tell the relative troublesomeness of Indian students versus other students. We do know that the school dropout rate for Indian students is very high. There are indications that this is a special problem. On some truancy lists issued by Phillips Junior High 90% of the list is Indian students, while only 33% of the student body is Indian. This seems also to show a special related problem.

Teachers at Phillips Junior High requested assistance through Human Relations seminars offered by Indian staff members at Phillips regarding methods of working with Indian children. Requests have been made by staff members of other schools for similar orientations programs. This is a general summary of ideas covering some of the reasons why assimilation into the school system is particularly difficult for Indian people.

This discussion of conflicts between Indian children and schools is, by necessity, general; it applies to some Indian children but not all. It is intended to offer explanations for some problems encountered by Indian students who come from families whose cultureal identity is strongly to moderately "old world," families like many of the Indian families served by the Student Support Program.

---

*This statement was originally prepared by Carolyn Brave Heart of the SSP evaluation staff. It was edited by the evaluator and is included in this Appendix to provide a descriptive statement of some special problems of Indian students in the schools.

Discussion

The Indian culture not only differs from the dominant culture but is neither well understood nor discussed by many of either the dominant or minority culture groups. A certain amount of alienation is certain from the day the Indian student enters the classroom. A school system requires certain levels of conformity from its students, especially during the early years of school. Indian students who come from homes whose preschool training, family habits and cultural values are different from those of the teacher must make substantial adaptations in order to fit comfortably in the classroom. There is often a lag between classroom demands and the student's ability to conform. The lag seems to increase as a student gets older. The Indian student may be attempting to adjust socially while peers are progressing in subject areas. By the time the Indian student reaches high school his basic skills may be far below the level needed to complete the course work. These people often act as if they are conforming, but the result may be only a lack of open conflict between the teacher and the Indian student and an increase in the conflict within himself.

What adjustments must Indian students make in order not to be a problem? The adjustment is certainly greater than that demanded of students whose parents support the values set forth by the teacher. While formal education is one of the highest priorities in the dominant culture, it is near the bottom of the list of priorities for many Indian families. The motivation to succeed within the educational system is lacking for many Indian students. They often do not share the educational goals assumed in the dominant culture.

A delineation of preschool experiences of Indian children points up basic areas of conflict between home and school. In comparison to white families, the urban Indian families are disorganized, and the Indian child often functions independently of the nuclear family. The authority figure in an Indian

child's life is often a composite of many adult relatives rather than one adult person. The urban Indian child may have many "homes" with cousins, brothers and sisters, or with any number of "grandmothers." Mobility is high. Therefore, as many Indian children continue their school experience, continuous experience within one particular school is often lacking, with the student never becoming a member of the student body but rather a continual visitor. The student turnover rate at Phillips Junior High, one of the schools served by the Student Support Program, is 50%. This means that only 50% of the students who start at Phillips stay there throughout the three year period. The other 50% transfer in or out at least once, and some transfer many times.

Many students have no direct contact with the reservation; yet the cultural influence is strong, even within some of the "assimilated families." Even within such families, apparent assimilation more likely represents a compromise forced by the necessity to survive than by a sincere conversion of heart and mind to dominant culture values. Cultural affiliation is a strong bond for these people, particulary for those whose families are rooted in the reservation. While basic value conflicts already exist, return visits to the reservation often reinforce these conflicts. While the school discourages emotionalism by demanding objectivity in the learning process, the reservation experience is primarily emotional in nature. The regathering of friends and relatives, the revival of old loves and hates, exchanging stories and gossip, all form an experience that minimizes objective discussion, the world of ideas or the appreciation for the "progressive society." Much the same can be said about the student whose family maintains reservation ties. When he enters his home at night, he has, in effect, returned to the reservation.

Many Indian students come from homes that are disorganized, near poverty level and permissive compared to the families of many of the other students and certainly different from the experiences most of the teachers within the school. While most

teachers demand respect by reason of their status, few Indian community members get respect from other Indians in terms of their position or formal education. The child accords respect only to those individuals who earn the respect of the child. In his life the child decides who to spend his time with, who to love, and who to avoid. The child tends to spend time with people who can fill his immediate needs rather than his projected needs. In general, Indian students respond to highly individualized, non-demanding and stable influences and avoid situations where coercion exists. They shy away from an atmosphere that is new (and consequently threatening) and need a great deal of guidance, encouragement and personal acceptance before he will feel a part of what amounts to, within the school system, a foreign culture.

Many Indian students avoid the threatening experience of attending class. Similarly, some are particulary adept at avoiding threatening situations by not showing up at appointed time; or, if they do show up, they sit silently without observable response. This reaction, which usually masks fear, anger or confusion, often infuriates a teacher, who may interpret the behavior as an insult. The situation can become a crisis of reaction-vs-reaction, with the complete withdrawal of the student. There is sometimes an emotional, abusive outburst that leads the student from teacher to the principal to the streets.

An alternative to withdrawal in these situations is often physical violence; the limited verbal abilities of many of these students is a problem in venting their feelings. In the Indian home conversations between children and adults are usually more limited than in the non-Indian home. While Indian people have nearly lost their native language, many have not gained an adequate grasp of the intricacies of English to work through conflicts confidently.

The Indian generally has lost his language that provided for expression of feelings, his religious system that provided for inner awareness, his status that provided for self-esteem, his cultural freedom that provided approved outlets

for frustration, and his freedom that provided for self-confidence. The school system is one agency that may be able to help improve this situation. The school is a strong force in the lives of most Indian people. The school then has an awesome responsibility not only to educate, but also to offer alternatives for personal recovery.

Perhaps the greatest area of need is in the early elementary grades where the Indian student experiences his first cultural shock of moving into the foreign culture of the schools. The child moves from a home that is generally quiet, slow-paced, non-demanding, accepting and free into the noisy world of crowded hallways, groups of children, school bells, arbitrary authority figures and routine. Teachers must be aware that if an Indian child is silent, it is usually not because of the mystical "stoic Indians," but often because the student has moved from one world to another. Many young students feel very uncomfortable and ill at ease in this new world. Special attention must be given to help the Indian child toward social adjustment before the demands of the curriculum overpower him.

In dealing with current Indian students it should be recognized that the experiences of Indian parents and relatives in school may have been traumatic. Some of the grandparents of children in the Minneapolis schools were sent to boarding schools in distant states, sometimes without the consent of their parents. In the name of "taming the savages" these schools insisted upon such things as non-use of the native language, strict out-of-school regimens, including chores, learning of many classical school subjects, and frequently skilled trade training in the upper high school grades. As was the custom in many schools of the time, thrashing with sticks or paddles was customary for violations of the rules. The "drop-outs" from these schools were legion; many students ran away from the school and attempted to go home.

Although the motivation of the staff of these schools was usually of the highest moral character, the effect on Indian students and the current Indian view of these schools is that they were attempting to destroy a culture and assimilate the

people into the dominant society. Historically, the American Indian has resisted these attempts to force their adoption of the dominant culture patterns.

The generally observed pattern of better jobs and more comfortable life styles being related to level of education are not obvious when observing the Indian population. A "good job" for most Indians involves different criteria than those of the dominant culture. Those American Indians who do have "good jobs" by the dominant culture criteria tend to be considered "non-Indian" by those who have a more mundane existence. Therefore, the pressures on Indian students from their parents to perform well in school tends to be less insistent than with many other students.

No general "solution" to the problems associated with Indian children in the schools is offered. There is only a general plea for interpretation of the observed behavior on the basis of understanding the cultural background of the student. The development of a climate in the classroom that is comfortable for Indian students is a challenge for teachers. The coordinate creation of trust by these students for the teacher is an apparent first step in the development of such an atmosphere.

Report of
Orientation Sessions
at Phillips Junior High School

Description

On six Tuesday afternoons between October 29 and December 17 a program was conducted at Phillips Junior High to increase teacher understanding of present urban Indian culture and to open up communications between teachers, administrators, students and community so that alternatives to the present school programs and policies could be investigated. The Human Relations Committee at Phillips cooperated in arranging the program. Each teacher was expected to attend four two-hour sessions during released time.

Procedures

Basil Brave Heart, Coordinator of the Student Support Program at Phillips, assumed primary responsibility for conducting the program. Volunteers from the school and the general Indian community took part in the program. Panel members included: Basil Brave Heart, Carolyn Brave Heart of the Title VIII Evaluation staff; Elwin Benton, Minnesota State Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Richard Gresczyk, teacher at Phillips; Sheryl Gresczyk, past staff member of Upward Bound at Phillips; John Beaulieu, present head of Upward Bound at Phillips; and Muriel Peterson, part-time Social Worker with the Title VIII Student Support Program at Phillips.

General subject areas covered by the presentations were: the history of Indian education, recent considerations in Indian education, Indian attitudes toward education and urban society, Indian religious, family and social values, and relationships between teachers and Indian students.

At the end of each session participants were asked to fill out evaluation sheets. In May an evaluation sheet was again

distributed to all staff members. This was similar to the final summary evaluation questionnaire. It was intended to provide a longer range perspective on the usefulness of the program. This report summarizes the responses and comments made by the participants.

Results

After the introductory meeting the 58 program participants responded to two questions regarding the teachers' initial attitude toward the orientation. The questions were: Do you feel that this orientation topic is relevant and needed for the Phillips staff in general? Do you feel that this orientation topic is relevant and needed for you specifically?

The staff felt there was both a personal need and a general need for this kind of program. Many staff members stated during informal discussions that they hoped the orientation would provide information about the attitudes of Indian students and community members and that such information would improve communications among staff members.

As the orientation sessions progressed, general comments made by teachers showed that some of the teachers recognized a need for personal reassessment of attitudes. More recognized a need for guidance in developing a more relevant curriculum for Indian students. Many philosophical questions arose concerning long-discussed problems in Indian education such as the question of an all Indian school. Questions such as this remain unanswered nationally both inside and outside of Indian communities themselves. Therefore, the pursuit of such questions was not considered within the scope of the brief orientation sessions.

In general, comments showed a willingness to pursue such questions as a multi-ethnic curriculum, special interest classes for Indian students, increased hiring of Indian professionals and paraprofessionals, and the question of responsibility of the school to preserve Native American culture. Some staff members did not believe that an improvement in

student-teacher relations was needed at Phillips. Many of these same staff members did not feel that there was any need to re-assess their personal attitudes toward Indian students. It seemed that teachers were more willing to deal with theoretical questions in Indian education than with personal attitudes.

A final evaluation sheet was distributed at the end of the last orientation session. Teachers were asked to what degree the program met the stated objectives. The same questions were asked again several months later to assess the possible changes in attitude of the staff and the use to which the information had been put. The questions and tabulations of responses are listed below:

To what degree did the sessions meet the following objectives?

1. To provide information that will enable teachers to gain an understanding of the background and culture of the American Indian.

January	0%	30%	53%	14%	2%	0%
N = 43	0	13	23	6	1	0
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not at All	Omit
May	23%	15%	54%	8%	0%	0%
N = 26	6	4	14	2	0	0

2. To stimulate thought about alternatives to the present educational system and methods of handling Indian students.

January	5%	26%	39%	26%	5%	0%
N = 43	2	11	17	11	2	0
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not at All	Omit
May	12%	15%	46%	23%	4%	0%
N = 26	3	4	12	6	1	0

3. To provide direction for more positive interaction between teachers and Indian students.

January	7%	28%	38%	20%	5%	2%
N = 43	3	12	16.5	8.5	2	1
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not at All	Omit
May	4%	23%	38%	31%	4%	0%
N = 26	1	6	10	8	1	0

4. To stimulate staff discussion and to stimulate the examination of personal attitudes toward Indian students at Phillips.

January	5%	42%	30%	16%	2%	5%
N = 43	2	18	13	7	1	2
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not at All	Omit
May	8%	38%	31%	19%	4%	0%
N = 26	2	10	8	5	1	0

5. To stimulate staff action in encouraging changes in school policy which will make the school more responsive to the needs of Indian students.

January	5%	9%	45%	34%	5%	2%
N = 43	2	4	19.5	14.5	2	1
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not at All	Omit
May	8%	8%	38%	31%	15%	0%
N = 26	2	2	10	8	4	0

In the January evaluation questionnaire teachers were asked whether or not they felt the methods of presentation (which were primarily lecture, panel discussion and small group discussion) were effective. Of the 41 who answered

initially, 29 said yes, 12 said no. In later comments, many people expressed the wish for more interaction between teachers and speakers by changing the format to include smaller groups, less formal presentations and more time for discussion.

When asked what the most valuable result of the orientation sessions were, one person commented, "It wasn't valuable. Indians are not so darn different from blacks and whites..." However, most respondents offered a more positive attitude toward the orientation experience. About a fifth of the people (8) remarked that the explanations of certain behaviors, such as the refusal of an Indian student to look a teacher in the eye, was most helpful in developing psoitive personal interaction with Indian students. One teacher said, "It was most valuable to gain .. insight into the way of life of the Indian people which results in some of the behavior exhibited at school." Five people cited the continuing dialogue concerning problems at Phillips as the most valuable result of the orientation. One such person said, "We seem to have identified some of the problems. Progress toward a solution can't take place until this has happened." Two people pointed out the important result of the emergence of Native Americans within the Phillips staff as leaders and resource people. Two people mentioned that the printed materials, including a resource directory, were especially helpful.

Another question asked, "What further subjects or activities should be included in any future orientation sessions?" A multitude of answers were given, perhaps indicating that the conservative estimates of the value of the orientation indicated in the first section are a reflection of a need and desire to pursue additional questions and alternatives. The greatest area of interest revolved around further discussions of specific problems faced within the Phillips school and community. Comments from 15 people stressed this area of need, including one who asked for more guidance in confronting and working with individual students, two who asked for more factual data on the extent of Indian problems within the school and

the community, three who asked for more case studies during which present attitudes and alternatives can be discussed, and two who asked for more specific information on "what to do and how to do it." Two people wanted to pursue the feasibility of introducing alternative education and Indian studies programs into Phillips. Five asked that students and community members directly participate in further discussions regarding improving teacher-student-parent relationships. The general flavor of these requests was for continued dialogue and increased information that will lead to better understanding between teachers and Indian students. Two people suggested that smaller groups would have helped to facilitate communication between teachers and panel members within the confines of the four session orientation.

Another question asked, "Did the orientation sessions stimulate you to reassess your interactions with Indian students?" Seventeen said they did, seven said they did not and 19 omitted the question. In relation to this question, teachers were asked, "Behaviorally, how have you changed?" Six answers were emphatically summarized by one person who said, "I haven't, have you?" Four reported that they have reassessed their expectations of Indian students. Three felt they were better able to work constructively with Indian students because of the orientation. Comments were generally centered around an increased understanding of how the Indian student is affected by his culture, but they did not, at this point, indicate concrete behavioral change on the part of teachers.

In the May evaluation questionnaire one additional question was asked--"Do you now feel the program was more or less helpful than you originally perceived it to be?" Eight responded that it was more helpful, twelve that it was less helpful, and six reported no change. These twenty-six respondents did not seem to indicate much change in either answers to the specific questions or in their comments.

Interpretations and Recommendations

A final section on both evaluation sheets invited any other comments the teachers wished to make. Most of these comments have been summarized previously in this report. However, one comment was made that deserves the serious consideration of both the school and the community. The comment was, "What happened to other members of the Student Support Program and other Native Americans?" This question concerned the fact that Indian people were obviously not anxious to take part on a continuing basis as panel members in the orientation activity. Herein lies one of the greatest difficulties in presenting an effective orientation of this sort. This question points up a serious discrepancy between the opinion stated by some teachers that personal attitudes toward Indian people need not change, and the position held by panel members that the school system has, in the past, been seriously deficient in acknowledging the depth of the basic value conflict that exists between the Indian and the dominant culture.

Discussion seemed to be inhibited by the fact that one of the major panel members was non-Indian. This not only made the orientation panel less convincing but also afforded the opportunity for some teachers to avoid confronting the issues by questioning the authority of the non-Indian panel member. Many Indian people who were asked to take part in the orientation were reticent to do so (most flatly refused to do so), some because they did not feel confident in their ability to speak before a group, some because they did not want to expose their personal attitudes or because they did not want to be called an "Indian expert." Many Indian people feel that demands are made upon them to produce definitive solutions to so-called "Indian problems" simply because they are Indian. They feel that non-Indians fail to appreciate the diversity of individuals within the Indian culture and are reticent about being labeled as a spokesman for all Indians. Many potential panel members refused to take part because they felt there was no use trying to talk, that nobody would change anyway. They further felt

that not only would talking not help but that talking to such a group would only single them out as trouble makers and make them targets of the hostility of individuals within the group.

Certain changes might be considered in planning any further orientation activities. Groups would probably be more effective if limited in number to provide more discussion and interaction with group leaders and between participants. Beyond this, opportunities might be provided whereby interested teachers could investigate specialized areas of thought which were merely touched upon in the four-session activity. For example, it would be helpful for teachers to have a greater understanding of past and present philosophies and movements in Indian education, a deeper understanding of present urban Indian problems, etc.

Observations of the orientation activity indicate that Indian people must take the leadership in speaking for themselves; that they do feel seriously alientated from people within the school; that communications between the school and Indian parents and community members must be encouraged and increased; and that open sessions such as the orientation activity is a positive way for Indian community members to voice their opinions. A continuing open attitude on the part of Phillips administration and many staff members should help to improve school-community relations and to overcome the distance between people there.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT OF TITLE VIII STAFF MEMBERS

INTRODUCTION

Minority group members often state that increasing the number of minority members in responsible positions within a school system increases the acceptance of the school by minority students. Too often members of the American Indian community feel that school policies are formulated by members of the dominant society who are unsympathetic with or who do not understand the Indian people. Indian students face classes that are planned and conducted by white teachers whose cultural viewpoints and values are foriegn to their own. The result is often alienation and hostility, which interferes with the student's ability to gain a realistic grasp of the demands of the school system. A progressively larger number of American Indian students graduated from the Minneapolis high schools during the years between 1969 and 1975. This increase may be due in part to the increased number of American Indian professionals and paraprofessionals working in the school system, with the attendant better understanding of the schools by the Indian community and a better understanding of the Indian by key employees of the school system.

One of the avenues for bringing American Indian personnel into the school system has been the Title VIII Drop-Out Prevention Program. Since its incorporation into the schools in 1971, the program has made an effort to employ American Indian professionals and paraprofessionals. Following is a summary table which shows the American Indian staff and the American Indian student population within the schools from the years 1969 through 1974. These statistics are from the annual

Personnel and Pupil Sight Counts published by the Minneapolis Public Schools. This Sight Count is done in October of each school year.

Sight Count of Native American Staff and Students
in the Minneapolis School System; 1969-74

	1969		1970		1971		1972		1973		1974	
	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% If Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
Certified Staff	----	----	11	0.29	16	0.41	18	0.45	26	0.66	28	0.74
Non-certified Staff	----	----	37	1.40	30	1.07	35	1.23	68	2.12	70	2.32
Total Staff	32	0.50	48	0.75	46	0.68	53	0.78	94	1.30	98	1.44
Students	1843	2.7	1993	3.0	2225	3.4	2352	3.8	2545	4.3	2676	4.8

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Evaluation staff conducted a study to find out how the Title VII program has served as a vehicle for the employment and advancement of Indian people within the school system. We were interested in finding out how many of the people who have worked for SSP have increased their qualifications through formal training or have increased their skills through direct experience with the Minneapolis schools.

PROCEDURES

A list was made of all staff hired by SSP during the first three years of its operation. In this study the primary interest was in those employees for whom experience with SSP may have had a direct bearing on their motivation to pursue further

education or to qualify themselves for a job in education. Each employee (clerks were omitted) was listed according to his/her ethnic identification, initial date of employment, educational status at the time of initial employment, etc. Current staff members were asked about their own training, and, where possible, about the training of previous employees who are no longer with SSP. In some cases we were able to contact previous employees in person. But more often we had to rely on information supplied by acquaintances. One of the most difficult pieces of information to obtain was current employment status for employees who have left the program. Again, the primary source of information was present employees who are friends or relatives of previous employees. The data provided are the most recent information available to the evaluation staff as of the middle of October, 1974. An update of the information was done at the end of the program; the following paragraphs summarize these data.

RESULTS

Some information was collected for 96 current and/or former SSP staff members. There are 41 staff members who have been employed during the 1974-75 school year; 18 of these certified and 23 paraprofessionals. The following table describes the current and entire group by ethnic identification and certification status.

Ethnic Identification	Final Year's Employees		All Employees	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Certified	Non-Certified
American Indian	10	17	21	33
Black	1	2	3	7
Spanish Surname	0	1	0	1
Other (White)	7	3	18	11
Don't Know	0	0	2	0
Totals	18	23	44	52

Educational Attainments

Some of the SSP employees work part time for the program and go to school part time. Others are enrolled in evening courses while working full time. Program administrators encouraged staff members to increase their formal education. Forty-eight of the 96 are known to have enrolled in some college level (or graduate level) courses either during or subsequent to working for SSP. (Information was not obtained on 7 of the total group.) During their tenure on the program or since leaving employment with SSP, 16 individuals have been granted college degrees--3 doctorates, 7 masters level, 5 bachelor and 1 Associate of Arts degree. In addition, 25 other current or former staff members are relatively close to formal degrees--7 working toward a doctorate, 8 toward a masters and 11 toward a bachelors degree.

Current Employment

Information concerning current employment is difficult to obtain for some of the former employees. This is especially difficult for those who worked for SSP a short period of time and/or who left several years ago. Of the 55 who are no longer with SSP, relatively definitive employment information was obtained for 45. About one-half of these (22) are currently employed in a school system; this includes 6 who are working in the Minneapolis schools (not on SSP), 12 who are working in other school systems and 4 who are in graduate school with employment other than SSP. Three of the former SSP employees have directed Title IV programs in Minnesota school systems. (Title IV is an Indian educational program.)

As the Student Support Program is phased out, the subsequent work activities of the staff is in question. A few will be working in the Minneapolis schools, some may be in other school systems or other jobs.

SUMMARY

The Student Support Program has hired a substantial number of minority employees (primarily American Indian). Many of these employees have enrolled in college programs to increase their formal education. The continuing involvement of these employees in education as teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals will hopefully assist in providing a climate in the schools which will be more comfortable for minority students. Most of these employees have demonstrated that they feel additional education will be useful in their subsequent employment. These individuals are visible models for students in the public schools. Hopefully, one of the outcomes of the Student Support Program will be to encourage students to emulate these models.

To: Donald G. Gurnoe, Project Director, SSP

From: Dale W. Dysinger, SSP Evaluator

Date: July, 1975

Subject: Special Project Hiring Policies

In the past years we have discussed a number of problems associated with staff hiring procedures for SSP. It seems appropriate for me to formally document some of the basic issues along with some suggestions for remediation. In this brief memo some general considerations are discussed initially; then the professional staff hiring policies and the paraprofessional staff issues.

General:

Some considerations apply to school, union and civil service personnel policies. When an employee is hired for a special program, there is an implication that the person's qualifications and skills should meet overall policy guidelines as well as specific project requirements. This "dual" aspect of the hiring decision requires additional time and is often difficult to accomplish. The person selected may only marginally meet the two sets of criteria. For example, in the SSP situation there was a concerted effort to hire paraprofessionals who live in the neighborhoods in which our students live and who additionally share their ethnic identification. It could not be claimed that these criteria for selection necessarily produce the "best qualified" employees available for general school positions. For the special program, SSP, it was judged that these individuals would provide better contacts with SSP students and families. The professionals selected also tended to be minority persons who could relate to both students and the "community."

It is understandable that both civil service and the school administration want to review hiring policies of special projects (and even review specific hiring decisions) since upon phasing out of a project these employees may have acquired tenure. They are then employees of civil service pool or the school system even though the available positions may not be appropriate to the particular skills that were important for the experimental special program.

Paraprofessional hiring:

All paraprofessionals on the SSP staff were hired through the Minneapolis Civil Service system. For job titles that are currently in the system, new hiring was required through current lists of eligible personnel. Civil service understandably does not want to institute many new job categories for special projects. (It is always easier to add job titles than to delete titles that are already on the list.) Therefore, some "job requirements" are utilized to "cull" the list so that employees with inappropriate job qualifications are eliminated. Our parent aides, for example, were selected from a very limited group; some of these individuals would not be "highly qualified" for a broad range of civil service jobs even though many were valuable to the project. The medical and other personnel screening procedures required by a civil service system eliminated several potentially good SSP employees. In addition, the pay scale that should be paid for our special experimental project was higher than the initial job category pay scale within the civil service system. Problems with personnel turnover was excessive until the new job category (and higher pay scale) was instituted through the rather complex civil service system.

Professional staff hiring:

School hiring practices of professional personnel are also geared toward general usefulness of the new personnel after the special project has been phased out. These policies

and practices are also involved with state requirements and accreditation implications. It seems to me that these restrictions are overall more defensible. However, the issues associated with appointing teachers who are knowledgeable in "basic skills teaching" (which tend to be teachers with elementary school certificates) in the secondary schools did present some problems for SSP. These issues are not easily handled within the school personnel office, since the regulations are dictated by accreditation and state requirements.

Recommendations:

The primary problems associated with quickly intiating a new project relate to the hiring of appropriate staff within a reasonable time frame. In the first year of SSP the assembling of staff and initiating the program in the target schools required essentially the first semester. Although there was a sizeable delay in initial funding approval, some of this delay was associated with the time needed for hiring personnel. In subsequent years similar delays were encountered in replacing personnel who left the program. Most of the procedures that delay the decision relate to the understandable concern of both the school and civil service that new employees meet their criteria for employment. Therefore, it would seem possible for special dispensations to be given "special projects" that have a fixed duration, to hire outside of either of the personnel systems. This would, however, require that these special employees not necessarily acquire tenure or other job rights associated with employment. (It would, in essence, be a reinstitution of many "contract" employees to staff these special programs.) Personnel who are already on civil service or school rolls would be able to work on the special project and maintain their tenure and job rights. We know that there can be abuses to this sort of contract arrangement; however, the monitoring of such a project by the Federal Projects Office of the school system could be utilized to protect against these abuses.

If new employees wanted to be "certified" into either the professional or paraprofessional ranks, examinations of formal credentials and applying of the appropriate hiring criteria could be done at a more leisurely pace during the period that the employee was working for the project.

In my judgment very few of the individuals who considered employment with SSP would have objected to such an arrangement. A few individuals who might have helped the project could not be considered for regular appointments because of problems in meeting general employment criteria or because the granting of tenure and job rights was not desired by the employer.

The advantages of 20-20 hind sight are acknowledged; but it seems to me that the above suggestions could have alleviated some of the SSP personnel problems over the past four years, and these suggestions may be useful to school and civil service personnel offices when future special programs are initiated.